



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY



From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

1

1

1

1



AN
INQUIRY
INTO THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE CONCERNING
THE
DEVIL AND SATAN:
AND
INTO THE EXTENT OF DURATION EXPRESSED BY
THE TERMS
OLIM, AION, AND AIONIOS,
RENDERED
EVERLASTING, FOREVER, &c.
IN THE COMMON VERSION, AND ESPECIALLY WHEN APPLIED
TO PUNISHMENT.

SECOND EDITION.

BY WALTER BALFOUR.

CHARLESTOWN (Ms.) DAVIDSON, PRINTER.

1827.



BT
980
132
1827
COP. 1

District of Massachusetts, to wit :

BE IT REMEMBERED, That on the thirtieth day of December, A.D. 1826, in the fiftieth year of the Independence of the United States of America, **WALTER BALFOUR**, of the said District, hath deposited in this office the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as Author, in the words following, to wit :

"An Inquiry into the scriptural doctrine concerning the Devil and Satan : and into the extent of duration expressed by the terms *Olim, Alon, and Alonios*, rendered everlasting, forever, &c. in the common version, and especially when applied to punishment. Second edition. By Walter Balfour."

In conformity to the act of the Congress of the United States, entitled, "An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts and Books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned;" and also to an act entitled "an act supplementary to an act entitled 'an act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned, and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving and etching, historical and other prints.'"

JOHN W. DAVIS,

Clerk of the District of Massachusetts.



CONTENTS

PART I.

	Page.
Introduction	v
SECT. I. Common opinions of the Devil and Satan briefly stated	13
SECT. II. Remarks on Genesis 3, showing that the serpent which deceived Eve was not a fallen angel	19
SECT. III. All the texts in the Old Testament where the original word Shaitan, or Satan occurs, considered	35
SECT. IV. The opinion that the Devil or Satan is a real being, with other connected opinions, shown to have their origin in heathenism	64
SECT. V. All the passages in the New Testament where the term Satan occurs, considered	98
SECT. VI. All the passages where the original word Diabolos, translated Devil, is used, considered	116
SECT. VII. All the passages considered in which the terms Devil and Satan are used synonymously	151
SECT. VIII. All the texts considered where the Devil is supposed to be called the evil one, the tempter, the great dragon, the serpent, and old serpent, the prince of this world, the prince of the power of the air, and the god of this world	169
SECT. IX. Facts stated, showing that the Devil is not a fallen angel, or real being	180
SECT. X. Objections considered	190
SECT. XI. Concluding remarks, pointing out the evils which have arisen from the common opinions entertained of the Devil and Satan	198

PART II.

- SECT. I.** All the texts noticed where *Olim* occurs in the Old Testament, but is rendered by words which do not express or imply endless duration
- SECT. II.** All the passages noticed where *Olim* is used, and rendered by words which convey the idea of endless duration
- SECT. III.** All the texts where *Olim* occurs, is rendered by words which convey the idea of endless duration, and applied to punishment, particularly considered
- SECT. IV.** General remarks on *Aion* and *Aionios*, as used in the New Testament
- SECT. V.** All the places noticed where *Aion* and *Aionios* are rendered ages, course, never, forever, evermore, eternal, everlasting; but which have no relation to punishment
- SECT. VI.** All the places where *Aion* and *Aionios* are rendered world, considered
- SECT. VII.** All the places where *Aion* and *Aionios* are used to express the duration of punishment, particularly considered, in whatever way rendered in the common version
- SECT. VIII.** Concluding remarks on *Olim*, *Aion* and *Aionios*, throughout the Bible, whether applied to God, to life, or punishment

INTRODUCTION.

IN presenting the following pages to the public, were any apology necessary, I would make it in the words of Professor Stuart to Dr. Miller. He says, p. 12, 13. of his Letters, "It is just as much our individual duty now, to bring every principle of the creed of the Protestant churches to the test of the divine word, as it was the duty of the Reformers to bring that of the Catholics to the test of Scripture: This position is absolutely certain; unless we can prove that the formers of the Protestant symbols were inspired. If they were not, they may have *erred* in some things; and if so, it is important to us, if possible, to know in what they have erred. But how shall we, or how can we know this, unless their creeds are subjected, anew and repeatedly, to the test of the Scriptures?"

"Will it be said, that the dwarfs of modern days only exhibit their pride and self conceit in attempting a comparison with those giants of yore? If it should, my answer would be; That dwarfs as we are in modern days, we stand, at least, upon the shoulders of those ancient giants, and must needs have a somewhat more extended

horizon than they. To speak plainly, the whole word of God represents the path of the church, like that of the just, to be as light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day. The kingdom of God always has been, and still is, progressive. Glory is bursting in upon the church, in various ways intimately connected with making her light to shine still more brightly. Is she yet perfected in doctrine? Are all the treasures of the divine word yet unlocked? Are her fairest days past, and her brightest constellations set, to rise no more? The 'thousand years,' of glory yet to come, will supply a ready answer to these questions.

"So long as we profess to be Protestants, and of course, profess to believe that the Bible is the *sufficient and only* rule of faith and practice, so long, if we act consistently, we believe in the symbols of faith which we receive, *only* because we find them supported by the Scriptures. It is not only lawful then to put them to the test; but it is an imperious duty for every man to do it, who is able to do it. There may be a show of modesty and humility in receiving what others have believed, without examination and without scrutiny; but in every case, where there is ability to investigate and bring to the Scripture test, a failure to do it must arise from undue regard to the authority of fallible men, or from mere inaction—from absolute sloth."

According to my ability I have endeavored to bring to the Scripture test two very important articles in the Protestant creeds—*Is the devil a*

fallen angel or real being?—Are the terms Olim, Aion, and Aionios, rendered everlasting and forever, used by the sacred writers to express endless duration when applied to punishment? These are the two principal points on which I wished my investigations to bear. Other articles of the Protestant creeds, particularly those noticed in Part 1. Section iv. intruded themselves in the course of my researches, and it was deemed proper to give them a due share of attention, being very closely connected with my subject.

The importance of the articles I have attempted to discuss, few will question. Their relative importance to others discussed in the present day, as far exceed them, as the substance exceeds the shadow. If it be worth while to inquire, how many persons there are in the Godhead, or was the second person eternally begotten, it is surely of greater importance to inquire, is the devil a person or real being, and is he possessed of the almost infinite powers which have long been ascribed to him. And is it true that this being has ruined the human race, which ruin shall end in the everlasting destruction of not a few of them? I agree with Professor Stuart, that "glory is bursting in upon the church, in various ways intimately connected with making her light to shine still more brightly." Believing, that the common doctrines of the devil and eternal punishment have long been a disgrace to the church of God, I have ventured to attempt their removal, that her light may shine more brightly. None ought to be offended at the attempt, for if such doc-

trines be false, surely none in the symbols of Protestant churches have so much eclipsed glory as they have done. If it should be proved that I am mistaken, and that such doctrines are diadems in the crown of the church of God, glory must even be promoted by this investigation, for it will be made the more manifest that the devil and eternal punishment are her glory. As Mr. Stuart justly observes, a failure to investigate such articles in the Protestant creed "must arise from undue regard to the authority of fallible men, or from mere inaction—from absolute sloth."

It may be thought by some, that if the truth be stated in Part i. Sect. 4. be true, the Second Part is a superfluous discussion; for it follows as a course, that endless punishment cannot be proved. This we admit; but the texts where everlasting is applied to punishment, will not be given up so many, as teaching endless punishment, until a rational, Scriptural interpretation is presented, showing that their former views of them are correct. I here can speak from experience; I never would have relinquished the doctrine of endless punishment, unless I had come to see how such texts could be fairly explained as teaching it. I have felt the power of such views on my own mind, and make allowance for others in the same condition. On this account, if my explanations of the texts where everlasting is applied to punishment be correct, the Second Part, so far from being superfluous, is highly necessary. Many of my former friends

have no doubt wondered, how I could embrace my present views with such texts staring me in the face. One object with me, in the Second Part, has been, to show, that I did not shut my eyes to these texts, but being opened to very different views of them, I finally embraced my present opinions. Whether my present views be correct, they can now see and judge for themselves. If I have embraced error, they are requested to have the goodness to correct it.

In the following pages, we have expressed our opinions frankly and sincerely, and appealed to the Scriptures as the test of truth. The author hopes that the spirit in which his remarks are made can give offence to none. He has studied to avoid all harsh and provoking language, convinced that man's wrath can never work the righteousness of God. If he has in any instance turned aside from this path, he shall regret it much more than any of his readers, for his object is to convince, not to irritate. Should it be said, some of the opinions controverted are not held now by our orthodox brethren, nor durst any preacher avow them, without forfeiting his station. We are glad to hear of this, but doubt if it is without exception true; and certainly, we have never heard, that any public disavowal of them has ever been made. For example; has it ever been openly disavowed, that infants may be eternally damned? And is it universally disbelieved, that the happiness of those in heaven, shall be sweetened to all eternity in beholding others in eternal misery? If such opinions are not held,

why not publicly denounce them? For it will not be denied, that they have been held by Calvinists in ages that are past. At any rate, we would say, it has been far from our heart to misrepresent the opinions of our brethren.

Should any one reply to the following pages, the author begs leave to say, that it will be of no consequence to point out defects in his manner of discussing the subject, or to show that in some instances he has misunderstood the many texts which have come under his consideration. As to the first, had his time and avocations permitted, he might have rendered the work freer of defects. As to the last, though he has used all means in his power to interpret the Scriptures correctly, yet it would be surprising, if in no instance he had misunderstood the sacred writers. A reply merely bearing on these points he will pass over in silence. But if any one will show, that *the devil is a fallen angel*, and, that *the punishment of the wicked is of endless duration*, he will listen with profound attention to whatever may be advanced. He will attend to argument and evidence drawn from Scripture, come from what quarter they may, whether stated in a good or bad temper of mind. If convinced he is wrong, he will be silent, but if not, he will claim the privilege of stating his reasons for his dissent. Whoever undertakes to reply, we beg of them to give us proofs, and not mere assertions, for what they may advance, and to pay particular attention also to what we have advanced in Part i. Sect. 4. To point out defects, without fairly meeting

the grand points at issue, will be considered no answer.

I make no apology for availing myself of quotations from various authors in the course of my remarks, for they are chiefly taken from writers whose religious creeds embraced the opinions which I have controverted. None of them are taken from professed Universalists, for by most people their testimony would be deemed exceptionable, however well supported by evidence. The testimonies quoted in favor of my opinions, are from men competent to judge, and in high repute as critics and commentators among orthodox people. They are quoted, not to give sanction to my views by the weight and number of their names, but on account of the evidence which they produce.

In the present work, the strongest texts in favor of endless punishment are considered, and attention given them in proportion to the degree of stress laid on them in favor of this doctrine. In some instances, we have referred to our former Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna, for an illustration, which the reader will please consult. And in all cases, we hope the texts referred to, but not quoted at length, will be turned to and read, as they confirm or illustrate the sentiments advocated.

The author is deeply sensible, that the sentiments he has advanced are very unpopular, and will be condemned by many without a hearing. He is sorry for such persons on their own account ; *for this cannot stop the advance of light*

and knowledge in the present day, any more than sleeping all day can stop the sun in his course. If what I have advanced be true, it must prevail against all opposition, for great is the truth, and it must prevail. If my sentiments are false, the sooner they are refuted, neglected and forgotten, the better. If this can be done, it no doubt will be done, and to the doing of it we shall add our hearty amen.

NOTICE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

IN this Second Edition, the corrections, alterations and additions which have been made from that of the first, are chiefly verbal, and require no particular specification. So far as the author knows, no person has yet attempted to show to the public that his views are unscriptural; and nothing has occurred to himself, tending to alter, but rather to confirm him in his opinions.

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE DEVIL AND SATAN.

SECTION I.

COMMON OPINIONS ENTERTAINED OF THE DEVIL AND SATAN BRIEFLY STATED.

THE opinions entertained of the Devil and Satan are many. We shall give a brief summary of them under the following particulars.

1st. *The Unity of the Devil.* It is the common opinion, that there is but one being properly called *the devil*. The unity of God is not more certainly believed, than that the Devil or Satan is one. Though God is said by many to be three persons in one being, yet the devil has never been supposed to be more than one person in one being. Dr. Campbell, Dissert. 6. says, "nor can any thing be clearer from Scripture than that, though the *demons* are innumerable, there is but one devil in the universe."

2d. *The Origin of the Devil.* The common opinions about this are :—that he was originally, one of the angels of God in heaven. God did not create him a

devil, but he became so, by his own sin and rebellion. It is also believed, that he drew a multitude of the heavenly hosts into rebellion with him, who have shared his fate; are called his angels, and that he has become their chief. His sin is supposed to have been pride; but how, or about what it arose, we have never seen properly defined. Neither is the time ascertained when all this took place; but must have been before Adam and Eve sinned, as he is said to have been their seducer. Supposing all this to be true, we can answer the long agitated question—"whence cometh evil?" It came from heaven. It originated among the holy angels of God. But how could it originate in such a place, and among such holy beings, I must leave for others to explain. Admitting such opinions true, permit me to ask, if sin once originated in such a place and among such beings, why may it not again, yea, often; and why not extend it to all the ransomed of the Lord? Why may they not all finally become devils by sin and rebellion against the Lord? What is the security given that nothing of a like nature shall ever take place again in the universe of God?

3d. *His expulsion from heaven and his place of abode since.* How long the devil maintained his place in heaven after he sinned, we have never seen stated. All agree, that he was cast out of heaven, but where he was cast to, and where his abode has been since, very various opinions are entertained. Some say he was cast down to *hell*, and has been there in chains of darkness ever since. Others allege, that his abode is in the air or our atmosphere. The most general opinion is, that he walks about in our world like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour, and will continue to do so until the consummation of all things. Some have thought that he has his residence in the *heart of every wicked man*, and is the cause of sin

much evil being devised by it. These, with some other opinions have been entertained of the devil's residence since his expulsion from heaven, which we should think at least cannot all be true, and creates a suspicion that they may all be false.

4th. *The nature and character of the Devil.* The devil is universally believed to be a spirit, and a spirit hath not flesh and bones as we have. God is not more certainly believed to be a good spirit, than he is believed to be an evil and malignant spirit. Not one good quality is supposed to be in his nature or character. On the contrary, every evil, and that in the highest degree, is found in him. He is a perfect compound of all that is evil, and the irreconcilable enemy of God and man. As he is incapable of being made better, it is believed he is so bad that he cannot be made worse. To say a person or thing is as bad as the devil, is saying the worst that can be said concerning it.

5th. *The extraordinary powers ascribed to him.* Many people consider him almost omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent. He is supposed to know the thoughts, words, and actions of all men; that he is in all parts of the world at the same time; and effects things by his power, little inferior to God himself. God is the only being in the universe who is able to control him. He can assume any form, shape, or color; and though an angel of darkness, can transform himself into an angel of light. One would be almost led to think, that he had greatly increased his powers by his sin and rebellion, for no good angel is ever represented as possessing such extraordinary powers as Christians ascribe to the devil. If his powers have been curtailed by his rebellion against God, what must they have been before it?

6th. *How the Devil is employed.* It would be an endless task to enumerate all the various work in

which he is supposed to have engaged, since his expulsion from heaven. One of the first things he engaged in, was to tempt our first parents to sin, and thereby ruined them and all their posterity. Ever since, he has been seducing every son and daughter of Adam to all kinds of sin, fomenting all sorts of mischief, and producing misery in our world. He is supposed to be walking about seeking whom he may devour. He deceives the whole world, and accuses the very best of men before God. He infuses evil thoughts and desires into men's minds, and is ever ready to assist them in the execution of their wicked purposes, and the gratification of their sinful lusts and passions. He is supposed not only to inflict many severe bodily diseases, but to harrass the mind, so as to drive persons to distraction and suicide. He is believed to have been the cause of all Job's afflictions, to have bound a woman eighteen years with an infirmity, and urged Judas on in his course of wickedness until he betrayed Jesus, and was finally led to hang himself. He is also allowed to blind men's minds about the gospel, and harden their hearts, and is at work in the heart of every child of disobedience. He not only picks up the seed of the word when sown, lest men should believe it and be saved, but those who do believe it, are the objects of his particular malice, whom though he cannot ruin forever, he is determined to render as miserable as possible. All wicked men are his, and his care is directed to keep them under his power and dominion. Some marvelous accounts have been given, of his torturing and tormenting good people, and of some who sold themselves soul and body to him. At the stipulated time, he has come and carried them away bodily to hell. It is the belief of some, that at death, the devil carries off the souls of wicked men to the same place. Those who wish to inform themselves more fully may consult Boston's works, Ed.

wards, Jeremy Taylor, and many other authors on this subject. See also a print of hell, executed at Hartford, Connecticut, and sold in the bookstores in Boston. On a smaller scale, see a print of hell, handed about in Charlestown for the benefit of the sick and dying. And on a still smaller scale, see some school books, put into the hands of children. If any pious, sensible people are offended at these statements, let them consider, that they have more cause to be offended at the conduct of such pious people, which has occasioned these remarks.

7th. *The various names by which he is designated.*—What the devil's name was before he sinned in heaven we have never been able to ascertain; but it appears that good angels are distinguished in Scripture by names. Now, if we cannot ascertain who or what the devil is, it is not for want of names, which are supposed to distinguish him from every other being. He, it is thought, is called in Scripture, *satan*, the devil, the evil one, the tempter, the old serpent, the god of this world, the prince of this world, and the prince of the power of the air. These are his principal titles, with a few others which are of less consequence, and do not require any particular notice. He has also a great variety of vulgar names, which to put them on paper, would only be to promote the laughter of fools, which is no object with me in writing. If such a being does exist, we are called to weep, rather than to laugh. If he does not, I wish soberly and seriously to expose such a false and pernicious opinion. We protest against the common use of such names in daily conversation, whether people believe, or disbelieve the existence of such a being. One thing we would only remark, that all such vulgar names are designed to designate a real being or fallen angel, by people who thus use them.

8th. *His endless existence and future prospects.* It is not only believed that the devil does exist, but that he will forever exist, the same wicked and malignant being. It is the common opinion, that no saviour has, or ever will be provided for him. He is considered beyond the limits of God's mercy. This door is supposed to be forever closed to him, and his repentance and return to his former allegiance and happiness is considered utterly hopeless. Nor, is it even thought that he will ever desire it, but would scorn such a proposal; for his mind is made up, rather to reign in hell than serve in heaven. We are aware that some have held the opinion that he will finally be restored, and will be the last being in the universe who shall be delivered from future misery.

But it is the general opinion, that however miserable the devil is, he has nothing better to hope for; nor according to the common belief is he concerned for his own miserable condition. As God cannot, or will not alter it, so he disdains to complain, or to sue for mercy. With such an endless, dreary prospect of intolerable misery before him, yet he scorns to relent or submit, and his stout heart, supported by malice and revenge, is consoled, that if God is to be his eternal tormentor, to the same duration he shall be the tormentor of a large portion of mankind. Some have supposed that he is to be destroyed, as taught, Heb. 2: 14. 1 John 3: 8. What devil is meant will be considered in its place.

Such is a brief summary of the common opinions entertained of the Devil and Satan, and are by some still preached and published to the world. It is true, that the ancient zeal for such opinions has considerably abated, but still enough remains to prevent me from being a favorite with the religious public for calling them in question. From early life such opinions have been imbibed; they have been nourished and

engthened by religious instruction in after life; and in the universal influence of public opinion in their or, people have been deterred from inquiring—are *they* true? But, let any sober-minded man sit down and seriously reflect on such opinions, and we think must be satisfied they cannot all be true. They are at variance with each other, and some of them are credible and literally impossible, unless the devil is nearly equal to God himself. When brought to the test of Scripture and examined, we think they will be found wanting, and that they have no better foundation than the doctrine of witchcraft, which is now almost entirely exploded. The evidence of this hope will appear in succeeding Sections.

SECTION II.

MARKS ON GEN. 3. SHOWING, THAT THE SERPENT WHICH
DECEIVED EVE WAS NOT A FALLEN ANGEL.

IN considering the Scripture doctrine concerning the devil and satan, Gen. 3. claims our attention at its commencement. Those who are not familiar with its contents will please turn to it and read it. The common opinion is, that the serpent which deceived Eve, was a fallen angel, and is throughout the Bible called the devil and satan. This is taken for granted with so much confidence, that it will be considered vain and impious to call it in question. But to call it in question, and shall proceed to state facts and arguments, proving, that in whatever way this chapter ought to be understood, it gives no countenance to such opinions.

1st. Moses in the two preceding chapters of Genesis, makes no mention of an angel, who fell from heaven and had become a devil. If such an event had happened, or such a being did exist, he was either ignorant of it, was not authorised, or deemed it unnecessary to mention it. We may with equal truth assert, that God created the devil, as assert, that an angel by his fall from heaven had become so, from any thing that Moses has said in these chapters. But ought not his fall to have been announced in them, if it be true that he is spoken of in the third as the cause of the fall of man?

2d. It is a fact equally indisputable, that Moses in this account, does not say that the serpent was a fallen angel. It is from what he does say, that we can learn what he believed, and not from his silence on the subject. It is not easily conjectured, how such an opinion came to be inferred from this account. The circumstances related lead to a very different conclusion. I shall notice some of these. Observe then the connexion between the second and third chapters. In ch. 2: 19, 20. it is said, "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam, to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field, but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him." The third chapter begins thus—"Now the serpent was more subtiler than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." Any one reading these two passages, would conclude that the serpent was a beast of the field, which the Lord brought to Adam, and which he had named *serpent*. The connexion leads to this conclusion, unless we suppose God brought a fallen angel among the beasts of the

field to Adam, and that he gave him this name. But it would be foolish to assert this.

Again, let it be observed, that the woman did not accuse a fallen angel as her deceiver, verse 13. God says to her—"What is this that thou hast done?" She answers him, "the serpent beguiled me and I did eat." This proves that Moses did not believe that a fallen angel deceived Eve. Had either Eve or Moses believed such an evil being was the cause of her disobedience, would they have imputed it to a beast of the field? When God made inquisition, he traces the evil from Adam to the woman, and from the woman to the serpent, and here both stop. But had there been any other agent concerned, I ask, would either of them have stopped here? But again, Moses does not represent the serpent as a fallen angel in the punishment inflicted, verses 14, 15. It is evident God calls the deceiver of Eve *serpent*. If a fallen angel used this reptile as a cover for his deception, it is certain he is not accused of the crime, nor does he suffer any punishment. From any thing said in the account, we may as justly accuse the angel Gabriel of deceiving Eve, as a fallen angel, and the punishment inflicted, fell on, and was as much suited to the former as to the latter. Was this fallen angel to go upon his belly and to eat dust all the days of his life?

3d. But another fact is, Moses in no part of his writings, gives us any information about an angel who fell from heaven and had become a devil. Let any one sit down and read the five books of Moses, and he must rise from them fully convinced, that such a being is not once mentioned by him under any name. Had Moses only recognized the existence of such an evil spirit, there might be some ground for supposing that he used the serpent as a tool to effect the deception of Eve. But his entire silence on this subject, throughout his whole writings, forbids such a supposition.

For more than two thousand years then, such an evil being was unknown among men. Was Moses afraid to speak out on this subject? But pray what temptation had he to conceal such information? Let any candid man say, if Moses knew that such an evil being existed, had deceived Eve, was such an enemy to God and the human race, whether he would have been silent about him: such an important article we might naturally expect, would be conspicuous in his writings. But will any man affirm that this is the case?

4th. Another fact which strongly confirms all the preceding, is, that no Old Testament writer says that Moses by the serpent, Gen. 3. meant a fallen angel. They never speak of such a being by the name serpent, so that all foundation for such a supposition is out of the present question. But I ask, had they believed as people do now, would this have been the case? It is true, there are some texts in the Old Testament, from which it has been concluded that such a being is called satan. These will be fully considered in the next Section. Here, let the reader only notice, that no Old Testament writer considered the serpent a fallen angel, the devil of Christians. They frequently use the term serpent, but never insinuate that a fallen angel used this reptile in deceiving Eve. For four thousand years, then, no such opinion seems to have been entertained by any sacred writer.

5th. What shows conclusively that the serpent, Gen. 3. was not a fallen angel is, in the Bible there are both allusions and direct references to the account of Eve's deception and the entrance of sin, but no intimation is given, that a fallen angel was the cause of either. We shall briefly notice the principal of them. Paul, 2 Cor. 11: 3. says—"But I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve

through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."

Paul calls the deceiver of Eve *the serpent*, as Moses did, but not a syllable escapes him, that the devil used this beast of the field as a cover for his deception. If this was the orthodox belief in Paul's day, he gave no sanction to it as an inspired teacher. He agrees with all the preceding sacred writers, in being silent about the devil seducing our first parents. But surely I may ask, if Paul believed this doctrine, is it not strange, that in a direct reference to the deception of Eve by the serpent, he should give no intimation that such a wicked being was the principal agent? But again, Job says, chap. 31: 33.—"If I covered my transgressions as Adam by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom." But instead of the words, "as Adam," we have in the margin, "after the manner of men." But allowing the rendering in the text correct, Job gives us no hint that he believed an evil spirit was the cause of Adam's sin. Again, in Hosea 6: 7. it is said—"but they like men, (in the margin like Adam) have transgressed the covenant." But here as little is said about such an evil being. But a more direct reference we have, Rom. 5: 12—14. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: for until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come." Here Paul expressly declares, that by one *man*, and not by a fallen angel sin entered the world. But again, he says, 1 Cor. 15: 22.—"for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." See also verses 45—49. But still he does not say a word about the

devil or a fallen angel having any concern with either sin or death by Adam. But in 1 Tim. 2: 13, 14. the apostle directly alludes to the third chapter of Genesis. "But Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression." The apostle here says, Eve was deceived, but not a word about her being deceived by a fallen angel. He told us, 2 Cor. 11: 3. that the *serpent* beguiled her, and this is just what Eve said herself, "the serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." Gen. 3: 13.

Such are the references made in Scripture, to the account given us by Moses in the third chapter of Genesis, except two or three passages, where we read of that old serpent, the devil and satan. These will be considered in Section 8.

6th. But admitting it true, that such an evil spirit did exist, call him by what name you please, how is the character of God to be defended in not forewarning our first parents against his evil devices. It is very evident, not a word of caution was afforded them. They have to learn his existence by the mischief he does them, and if God gives them information afterwards concerning him, it comes too late to be of any benefit to them. Was God ignorant of the fall of this angel from heaven? Or, could he be ignorant of his evil devices, and not foresee the ruin of our first parents by him? This is impossible. Are we then to conclude, that God willingly concealed the knowledge of such a being from them, that they might be seduced and ruined? I should rather conclude that no such being existed, about which God could give them information. He did foresee the consequences of their being seduced, and he guarded them against the true tempter as we shall presently see.

7th. The fall of an angel from heaven, and his becoming a devil, is certainly a very remarkable event,

in the history of God's creation. It is rendered more so, by its connexion with the fall of man, in making him a sinner, and entailing, according to many, eternal misery on his posterity. The very nature of the case leads us to think, that Moses would have related the fall of this angel, before he introduced the fall of man. But nothing like this is found, nor is the one related as having any connexion with the other. Moses says just as much about the ascent of a devil to heaven, and becoming a good angel, as he does about the fall of an angel from heaven, and becoming a devil; and the deception of Eve, is just as much ascribed to the former as to the latter. Nor, does any later scripture writer teach the doctrine of a fallen angel, or ascribe the fall of man to his evil influence. But allowing the existence of such a being we would notice,

8th. There is no evidence in this account, that a fallen angel knew that one tree of the garden was prohibited, and it is not easy to understand how a mere serpent could know it. Did God inform the devil about the prohibition? Or was he present when it was given? It does not appear that Eve informed him, for the serpent began the conversation with her, and seems to have known all about it. This very circumstance, representing the serpent as perfectly acquainted with the prohibition, suggests a hint, that Moses merely used the serpent to represent something else, which will rationally account for this.

9th. Admitting for a moment, that the devil did assume the likeness of a serpent, how does this accord with the good policy which this arch deceiver is supposed to possess? This is the more surprising, as his advocates affirm, that he can assume a much more agreeable likeness than that of a vile, contemptible reptile. Besides, he does not seem to have chosen this appearance often since, for people represent him

as appearing in various forms, but seldom if ever in that of a serpent.

10th. Unless we believe that Eve was on familiar terms with the devil, and knew that serpents spoke and reasoned in those days, she was more likely to be frightened than deceived. A speaking serpent, or the devil under this likeness, would terrify the most courageous female among us. But Eve showed no signs of fear, or even suspicion on this occasion. She conversed with the devil, or the serpent, with as much apparent composure, as she could have done with Adam. The common belief makes her, a perfect holy creature, to fall before a temptation, and that by means of agents, which almost all her sinful posterity would have resisted. What man, what female, now, would be deceived into disobedience by a speaking serpent, or the devil under this likeness? If she, then, could not resist such a temptation, how can it be expected now, that her offspring can resist any temptation? All these things lead me to suspect, that this account of the deception of Eve by a serpent, was intended to teach us something else; and that we are indebted to Milton, rather than Moses, for the common opinions entertained on this subject.

I shall now state for candid consideration my own opinion of this passage. We find it then said, chap. 3: 1.—“Now the serpent was more subtile than any beast of the field.”—The question to be considered is—What serpent did Moses mean? Chap. 2: 19. would lead us to conclude it was a beast of the field. But it will be asked—What! could serpents speak and reason in those days? I answer, we have no evidence to believe that they did. It will be asked, what then did he mean by the serpent? I would answer this by asking—*did not Moses in this account mean to inform us how Eve was deceived, and how sin was first introduced?* To this all will readily agree. Well, the serpent was

more subtle than any beast of the field, and was the fittest creature which could be chosen to illustrate how Eve was deceived. Let it be recollected, that Moses wrote this account more than two thousand years after it happened, and selects the serpent, celebrated for its subtilty among mankind, when he wrote. And why might not Moses select this creature as a figure for deception, as other scripture writers do the lion for ferocity, the lamb for meekness, and the dove for harmlessness?

It will now be said, *allowing all this to be true, what was it that deceived Eve, and which Moses here represents by the subtilty of the serpent?* I answer, *lust or desire* in Eve, for what is lust but desire? That Adam and Eve were created with appetites or desires will not be questioned. They desired, or lusted after the fruit of the other trees of the garden, and ate of them. Nor would there have been any sin in lusting after and eating the fruit of the prohibited tree more than the others, but for the prohibition. It was this, and this alone, which could render it criminal. Before the prohibition was given, there was no sin in either. But this only provokes the question,—How came Eve to desire the fruit of the prohibited tree? Answer; she could no more prevent herself having desires, than she could have prevented herself being made, or made just such a creature with such appetites; and the very prohibition not to eat of this tree, was calculated to excite curiosity in her about it and create desire. What man has not known the truth of this from experience? The evil did not lie in Eve's having appetites and desires, but her appetites and desires took occasion from the very prohibition, and in this way she was deceived and eventually sinned.—What Paul says, Rom. 7: 7–11. Eve might have said: “I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known lust except, the law had said thou shalt not eat.

But sin taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I die. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For *sin, taking occasion by the commandment deceived me, and by it slew me.*" What does Paul here say *deceived* him? It was *sin taking occasion by the commandment*, or desire which is the origin of sin; for lust or desire "when it hath conceived bringeth forth sin." James 1:15. So in regard to Eve. There could be no difference betwixt Paul and her, unless we suppose one of two things. First, That Eve was created without lust or desire altogether, which was certainly not the case. Or, second, That she was incapable of desiring what God had prohibited. If so, then she would have been incapable of sinning. The event proved that she was not. It should ever be kept in view, that *sin* does not consist in having lust or desire, nor even in being tempted to gratify desire contrary to the commandment, but in complying with the temptation. Jesus Christ had desire, and was tempted, but resisted the temptation, as will appear in Section 7.

If the serpent then was more subtile than any beast of the field, it was the fittest creature which could be selected to show the *deceit* of lust. In this view, the whole dialogue between Eve and her own lust, is both striking and natural. The serpent or Eve's lust after the fruit says—"Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" Thus her lust takes occasion by the commandment to desire the fruit. But Eve knew the commandment, hence she replies to her lust—"We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." To

this Eve's lust replies—"Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil." Permit me to ask, could any thing be more fitly chosen to describe the artful, plausible insinuations of lust or desire after some forbidden object? But the woman ceases to oppose her lust, by reasoning further on the subject. "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be *desired* to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat." From its being said—"the woman *saw* that the tree was good for food," some have concluded, that she saw a serpent eat of the fruit, and no evil following, she concluded it must be good for her food also. If this was true, it was calculated to excite desire in her, and embolden her to proceed. It was also an additional reason for introducing the serpent into this account. If the word *saw*, is here used in the sense of *considered*, as is evidently its sense in some other parts of Scripture; she must then have *considered*, or inferred that the fruit was good for food, from seeing the serpent eat, or drew this conclusion, from looking at the fruit and the reasonings of her own lust or desire about it. The last I am inclined to think was the case. But let these things be as they may, it is certain the tree appeared pleasant to her eye, and *a tree to be desired to make one wise*. This her lust or the serpent told her. All of us know, that our lust is subtile and eloquent in its persuasions, and never fails to promise that we shall be wiser and happier by its indulgence. Eve was overcome by the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eye. She eat, and gave also to her husband and he did eat. He hearkened to the voice of his wife, and thus "*Adam was not deceived but the woman being*

deceived was (first) in the transgression." 1 Tim. 2: 14.

It will likely be said, plausible as this appears, what evidence have we that Eve's lust is here represented by the serpent, and that this dialogue was between her and her own lust? The evidence which inclines me to this view of the subject I shall very briefly state.

1st. I find lust or desire stated in Scripture to be the source or origin of transgression. James says, ch. 1: 15—"Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." See also chap. 4: 1. and other texts which I need not quote. The conceivings of lust after any object, never could bring forth sin, unless that object was prohibited. Paul says—"I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said thou shalt not covet." Rom. 7: 7. It is the doctrine of Scripture, and of common sense, that where there is no law, there can be no transgression. Allow me then to ask, must not lust in Eve have been the source of sin, just as it is in us? Can any good reason be assigned why it is now the source of sin in us but was not so with her?

2d. Sin, and lust the source of sin, are always represented in Scripture as *deceitful and beguiling*. Paul, Heb. 3: 13. speaks of the "*deceitfulness* of sin," and declares, Rom. 7: 11. that sin taking occasion by the commandment "*deceived*" him and slew him. And in Eph. 4: 22. he exhorts to put off—"the old man, which is corrupt according to the *deceitful lusts*." And as all the conceivings of lust are in the heart, it is said—"the heart is *deceitful above all things*." Jer. 17: 9. Such are merely a specimen of the texts which speak of this. The serpent then was more subtle than any beast of the field, and was just as fit to represent the deceit of lust, as the dove is to represent

the quality of harmlessness, or the lamb that of meekness. Those familiar with the scriptures know, that many of the beasts of the field are used as figures, in a similar way, which it would be tedious to detail. For example: our Lord says, "be ye wise as serpents and harmless as doves." And it is well known, that in Daniel and the book of Revelation, the writers deliver their prophecies under the figure of beasts, and other symbols derived from the material world.

3d. In after parts of Scripture, the serpent is in fact used, as a figure for cunning and deceit. The word rendered serpent in the account before us is *Nehesh*. Taylor says it signifies the "common snake. But in southern, hot, desert countries, the snakes may be larger or more venomous than in the cold northern climates." It is used literally for the snake or serpent, Job 26: 13. Eccles. 10: 8. Prov. 30: 19. Deut. 8: 15. Numb. 21: 7, 9. Amos 9: 3. Jer. 46: 22. Mic. 7: 17. Jer. 8: 17. Eccles. 10: 11. Amos 5: 19. Numb. 21: 6. The same word is used for the brazen serpent which Moses made, 2 Kings, 18: 4. Numb. 21: 9. Also for Moses' rod changed to a serpent, Exod. 4: 3. and 7: 15. It is used figuratively for tribes and nations, and to express a state of subjugation, degradation, &c. Gen. 49: 17. Isai. 27: 1. Mic. 7: 17. Isai. 65: 25. This word is also used figuratively, to set forth the deceit, and lies of wicked men. Please consult the following passages. Psalms 58: 3—5. and 140. 1—4. Eccles. 10: 11. Isai. 14: 29. Prov. 23: 32. If the cunning and deceit of the serpent was learned by men from experience and observation, and was used figuratively for this purpose, why not also by Moses in this account, in showing how Eve was deceived by her own lust? Was it not just as proper a figure, to show how sin entered by the deceit of lust, as to illustrate its deceitfulness, in its progress among men afterwards? If lust is deceitful

now, and if the serpent on account of its subtilty is a proper figure to express it, at what date shall we fix the commencement of its deceit, and the use of this figure, if my view of this subject is controverted?

4th. The view given of Eve's deception by the serpent, or her own lust, accords with every man's own experience. We all, like her, have appetites and desires, nor is it sinful to have them, or even to gratify them in the way, or to the extent God allows us. But I ask, where is the man to be found, who has not felt the conceivings of lust within him after some forbidden object? And can any man deny the subtle, deceitful influence, which lust or desire has had over his reason and understanding? Yea, I appeal to every man, if something of a similar dialogue has not taken place with him and his own lust, as I have said took place between Eve and hers. Our consciences, if well informed, will reason and remonstrate against our desires, and in favor of obedience to the commandment. And can the man be found, who will affirm, that his lusts have never flattered him into disobedience? In the very best of men, the flesh has lusted against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and made them exclaim—"O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death."

5th. The view I have given of Eve's deception, accords with what is stated in the subsequent part of the chapter. We shall merely glance at this. The first thing stated is—"the eyes of them both were opened," as the serpent or lust had suggested to Eve, verse 5. They came to know evil as well as good by disobedience, but it did not add to their happiness and comfort as was expected. Does not every man find this, who yields to the flattery of his lusts, and transgresses the commandments of God? But what *deserves our notice* is, the account to which the offend-

ers are called. Adam is first called up, and asked—"What is this that thou hast done?" He answers—"the woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree and I did eat." The woman is next interrogated—"what is this that thou hast done?" She answers—"the serpent beguiled me and I did eat." What serpent beguiled her? I have said her own lust taking occasion by the commandment beguiled her. Let us see how this view accords with the sentence pronounced on the serpent. God does not say to Eve's lust or the serpent—"what is this that thou hast done?" But—"because thou hast done this thou art cursed above all cattle; and above every beast of the field: upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." The sentence is in accordance with the figurative use of the term serpent. It would have destroyed the congruity of the account to have done otherwise. Well, let us see how this sentence agrees to men's bodily appetites and desires, as figuratively expressed by the term serpent. We have said that man was created with bodily appetites, passions and desires. These were given him to be in subjection to God's will, and not gratified beyond the limits which he had prescribed. Eve listening to them beyond this limit transgressed. In her and all who have followed her example, when gratified beyond this they become degraded and groveling even below every beast of the field. The real bodily wants of man are few, and their supply easily obtained. But to his artificial, sinful desires, no boundaries can hardly be prescribed. These often are so low, and filthy, that no beast of the field is ever found given to similar indulgencies. Men's lusts and passions—"are cursed *above* all cattle and above every beast of the field." Like the natural serpent, dust or earthly gratifications are their enjoyment, until the person

is created anew in Christ Jesus, and is led to place his affection on things which are above. What shall I eat, and what shall I drink, are the questions in which our bodily desires centre, and to have goods laid up for many years, to eat, drink and be merry, are their happiness. But the account proceeds—“And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel.” The seed of the woman here is generally understood to refer to Christ. Well, what is the seed of the serpent? I answer sin, for “when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin.” This agrees precisely to what Christ was manifested to do. “He was manifested to take away our sins.” This will be fully shown in Sect. 6. The Jews, who were of their father the devil, bruised Christ, in crucifying him, but he by his death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the devil. The enmity between the seed of the woman, and the seed of the serpent, is beautifully illustrated by such texts as the following. “They that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts. Walk in the spirit and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.” &c. To bruise a serpent’s head is to kill it. And Christ before he delivers up the kingdom is to accomplish the entire destruction of this devil and all his works. See 1 Cor. 15: 24, &c. Heb. 2: 14, 15. with many other texts.

I shall only add, that to represent Eve as holding a dialogue with her own lust or desire can create no difficulty to persons familiar with their Bible. The beasts of the field, and trees of the wood, are in the figurative language of Scripture represented as holding conversation together. Nor is the Bible wanting in examples of persons holding dialogues with them-

5. But I must suppress many additional remarks, which I intended to make on the three first chapters of Genesis, as the remarks already made, and the limits assigned to this part of the subject.

SECTION III.

THE TEXTS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, WHERE THE ORIGINAL WORD SHAITAN, OR SATAN OCCURS, CONSIDERED.

THE passages where the term satan occurs in the Testament, are now to be brought forward, and we request the reader to observe, if satan is a fallen angel and the serpent which deceived Eve, as is very generally asserted. We shall take up the passages, in the order they occur in the common version. Taylor, and other writers all declare, that the word satan signifies, "*an adversary*." In this sense it is understood by our translators, for this is their rendering of it, as we shall see immediately. It is then first as a noun feminine.

1. 26: 21. "And they digged another well, and called it sitnah: for that also: and he called the name of it sitnah."

If the term *satan* be the name of a fallen angel, it is strange, that the sacred writers should first apply it to a well. Had the existence of such a being previously announced, it might be supposed that it was the cause of the strife about this well, and on account of which it received this name. But nothing of this kind is to be found. The well is called *sitnah*, or

satan in the text, and we have *hatred* in the margin as its explanation. Hatred, is the act of an adversary, and the context sufficiently shows why it received this name. The *satan* here then, is *hatred*, or men's evil passions, a sense which we shall see it has also in other passages.

Numb. 22: 22, 32. "And God's anger was kindled, because he (Baalam) went: and the angel of the Lord stood in the way for an *adversary* against him.— And the angel of the Lord said unto him, wherefore hast thou smitten thine ass these three times? Behold I went out *to withstand thee*, because thy way is perverse before me." The word *satan* in the original of these two verses occurs twice, and is here rendered by the words *adversary*, and, *to withstand thee*. In the margin of the last verse we have, "*to be an adversary unto thee*." It is obvious, that the adversary who withstood Baalam, instead of being a fallen angel, was the angel of Jehovah. It is then a remarkable fact, that the first time the term *satan* is applied to any being in the Bible, it is to a good being. But this is concealed from the reader by rendering the word *satan*, adversary. It may be observed here, and the remark applies to other texts, that had the original word been always retained in the text, or had it been uniformly rendered adversary, we would have been less liable to mistaken views on this subject. Had the first been done, we must have recurred to the context and scope of the writer to ascertain what he meant by *satan*, and if a being, what being was referred to. It would have been easily perceived, that some human adversary was referred to, or the angel of Jehovah as in the passage before us. But the word *satan* being sometimes retained in the text and sometimes rendered adversary the common Scripture usage of this word is not perceived. Besides, people from education and habit, have attached the idea

of a fallen angel to the word *satan*, which always suggests the idea of such a being. But not so with the word *adversary*, which is its rendering in many passages. Accordingly it is on the texts where the term *satan* is left untranslated, that people have built their faith about a fallen angel. This idea has been associated with this word in their minds from childhood, and it is next to impossible to effect a separation. The term *satan* will suggest it, and the meaning of the word, its scripture usage, and the context of the places where it occurs, are not sufficient to destroy it. Commencing the study of the Bible with this false idea, all must see, how many texts may be perverted, not from design, but from the influence of this false association. We know of no better way to correct it than to recur to the original sense of the term *satan*, and examine all the places where it occurs, with their respective contexts.

Should it be asked—why did not the translators of our English version either render this word always *adversary* or uniformly leave the term *satan* untranslated? I answer: had they always rendered it *adversary*, they could not so easily have infused into their version the idea of a fallen angel. Had they always retained the original word, its application to the angel of Jehovah, human beings and things, would have led people to conclude that it did not designate such an evil being. King James, under whose patronage the version was made, not only believed that *satan* was a fallen angel, but he wrote in defence of the doctrine of witchcraft.

1 Sam. 29: 4. "And the princes of the Philistines said unto him, make this fellow return, that he may go again to his place which thou hast appointed him, and let him not go down with us to battle, lest in the battle he be an *adversary* to us: for wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his master? Should

it not be with the heads of these men?" Here again the term *satan* is rendered *adversary*, and it is evident from the context, that David, not a fallen angel is meant. Nor, need this surprise us, seeing the angel of Jehovah was called so in the preceding passage. Many people do not know this, but it would have been evident had our translators, as in other places, left the term *satan* untranslated. This is the first place in the Bible where the word *satan* is applied to a human being, and it is applied to a man who feared God. It need not then surprise us, that our Lord called Peter, *satan*, and Judas a devil. It is very obvious, that the idea of a fallen angel attached to the word *satan*, is calculated to mislead us, for it is notorious, that this term is used to designate the very best of created beings.

2 Sam. 19: 22. "And David said, what have I to do with you, ye sons of Zeruiah, that ye should this day be adversaries unto me." Here the term *satan* is used in the plural, and is rendered *adversaries*. The satans referred to, are expressly called the sons of Zeruiah. Wicked men they might be, but no one supposes that they were fallen angels. Besides, it is commonly believed that there is but one being in the universe which goes by this name, yet here we find the term used in the plural and applied to men. In the New Testament we read of demons, and of a person possessed with a legion of them. But David does not say the sons of Zeruiah were demons, or possessed with demons or satans, but that they were *satans* to him. This shows clearly, that the term simply means an adversary, and that this was the sense David attached to it. We seldom if ever use it in the plural, for the unity of *satan* is the common belief just as much as the unity of God.

1 Kings 5: 4. "But now the Lord my God hath given me rest on every side, so that there is neither

adversary nor evil occurrent." Here the term *satan* is used in the singular, and is again rendered *adversary*. Solomon does not name, as in the preceding text, any person referred to, but the scope of the context evidently shows, that he had in view, human beings, who were accustomed to be satans or adversaries to Israel. His father David had many such satans to contend with during his reign, but now Solomon had none of them to disturb the peace of his kingdom. He therefore determined to build an house to the Lord, which his father was prevented from doing by his frequent wars with them. We shall soon see that Solomon was not altogether free from his troubles from such satans or adversaries.

1 Kings 11: 14, 23, 25. "And the Lord stirred up an *adversary* unto Solomon; Hadad the Edomite: he was of the king's seed in Edom. And God stirred him up another *adversary*, Rezon the son of Eliadah, which came from his lord Hadadezer, king of Zobah. And he was an *adversary* to Israel all the days of Solomon, beside the mischief that Hadad did: and he abhorred Israel, and reigned over Syria." In these verses the word *satan* is used three times, and is uniformly rendered *adversary*. The term is applied to human beings, who are distinctly named, Hadad the Edomite, and Rezon the son of Eliadah. The last was a *satan* to Solomon all his days. It would be ridiculous to suppose that *satan* here had any reference to a fallen angel; for in the first case it would be to make him an Edomite, and in the second the son of Eliadah, and that he was called Hadad and Rezon as well as *satan*. It is of more importance to observe, that it is said *God stirred up* those satans against Solomon. Had only one *satan* been mentioned, and no name given to show who was particularly meant, it is likely some would have concluded, that God stirred up a fallen angel against him. This conclusion would

have been as correct as that drawn from the next passage, where it is supposed *satan* means a fallen angel, because it is said, *satan* provoked David to number Israel, and in the parallel place that God moved him to do it. But here, it is put beyond all controversy, that *satan* has no reference to a fallen angel. We would then ask, ought not such texts, where the circumstances mentioned so clearly decide that this term designates no such being, to teach us caution in concluding that this is its meaning in any passage? When the word *satan* is introduced, and no circumstances are mentioned clearly to decide who or what is meant, is it rational or scriptural to say that a fallen angel or, wicked spirit must be meant? We should think not; and until it is satisfactorily proved, that such a being does exist, no rational man would ever think of such a conclusion.

1 Chron. 21 : 1. "And *satan* stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel." Here for the first time the word *satan* is left untranslated; but I can perceive no good reason why it was not rendered adversary, as it is in other places. No evidence appears from the text or context, that a fallen angel or wicked spirit provoked David to number Israel. If the rule in other cases be allowed here, plain passages ought to interpret doubtful and obscure ones, and common scripture usage of a word, ought to determine in particular cases in what sense the sacred writers used it. It is then determined here, for no previous scripture writer has said any thing about a fallen angel, or used the word *satan* in reference to such a being. Supposing they had done this, it would not be safe to conclude he was spoken of, for it is evident that the term *satan* is applied to human beings and to the angel of Jehovah in preceding passages, which might be the case here. In every text the question ought to be, what *satan* or adversary is in-

ended? As the word is not translated, and the idea of an evil being is associated with it in people's minds, and nothing directly being said to the contrary, it is concluded that this being provoked David to number Israel. Though the labor of proving this belongs to them, yet I shall offer the following remarks in proof of its falsehood.

1st. If the term *satan* designates in this passage a fallen angel, it is the first time we hear any thing concerning such a being in the Bible, under this or any other name. But it is evident *satan* is not here introduced as a new and extraordinary being, nor, is there any evidence that the word is used in a different sense from what it is in the passages already considered. To believe his existence from this text, is not only implicit faith, but in face of evidence to the contrary, arising from scripture usage of the word *satan*, and the silence of all preceding writers about such a being.

2d. Had the word *satan* been rendered *adversary*, as in other places, previous scripture usage would have led us to conclude, that one of David's enemies had menaced him with a new war, and thus provoked him to number Israel. It should be remembered, that the strength of Israel did not consist in the multitude of their armies, but their confidence in Jehovah and obedience to his laws. In thus numbering Israel, David sinned greatly, as it intimated a removal of his trust from God to that of the number and strength of his forces. It has been thought by some that David's sin consisted in his wishing to establish a military government for conquest, and hence gave orders to enrol all Israel for this purpose.

3d. But what in this passage is ascribed to *satan*, is in 2 Sam. 24: 1, ascribed to God. "And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, go number

Israel and Judah." We are sure that God tempts no man to evil, James 1 : 13. Should it be said God permitted satan, a fallen angel to do it, we ask where is the proof of this ? The passage affords none, except the gratuitous sense affixed to the term satan, which we have seen signifies an adversary. To say satan here means a fallen angel, is not only begging the question, but it is opposed to all former scripture usage of this word.

4th. When David's heart smote him for his sin, he imputes no part of the blame either to satan or God. No, he says—"I have sinned greatly because I have done this thing." 1 Chron. 21 : 8. Nor do we find that satan suffers any part of the punishment, or is threatened with any. Others suffered severely for his sin, but if satan was the chief cause of all this evil, why does he escape all punishment ? David does not plead his influence in mitigation of his offence, or the punishment it incurred. But if either God or a fallen angel moved David to commit this sin, why did no blame attach to them ?

5th. But some orthodox critics declare, that there is no reference to such a being in this passage. Parkhurst says, on this word ; "I would understand it, 1 Chron. 21 : 1. of a *human adversary* : compare 2 Sam. 24 : 1. which perhaps may be best rendered ; and again the anger of Jehovah was kindled against Israel, and David was moved against them by (one's) saying, or rather indefinitely, and one moved David against them saying, go number Israel and Judah." See Dr. Chandler's Life of king David. Farmer, on Christ's Temptation, quoting from Dr. Chandler, says, "for, speaking of David's numbering the people, he says, *if the devil had bid him do it, I suppose he might have seen the cloven foot, and would scarce have followed the measure for the sake of the adviser.*"

th. I would simply suggest it for consideration, David was not led to number the people from some passion or desire in his own mind, and that it is led satan. It is evident, that this is the sense of term in the first place it occurs, above considered. It men's evil lusts and passions are afterwards led satan in scripture will be shown in its place. This view is in unison with the way God says men tempted to evil, James 1: 14. Satan, we have seen, means an adversary. All acts of an adversary come from some opposing principle or desire in the mind. It is perfectly natural, and we shall see it is scriptural, to call the opposing principles or passions men by the name satan. But scripture usage of term will permit us to say, that satan who provoked David to number Israel, was either the evil desire of his own mind, or some human adversary. Obvious, and I think also after scripture usage of this kind, forbid us thinking that the satan who provoked David was a fallen angel. Nor would it be very strange, that the anger of Jehovah was in this passage satan referred to, seeing an angel of Jehovah is frequently called satan in a preceding passage. This is the view which some take of this passage.

Ezra 4: 6. "And in the reign of Ahasuerus, in the beginning of his reign, wrote they unto him an *accusation* against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem." In this text the word satan is a noun feminine and is rendered *accusation*. Notice, it is not the persons who wrote who are called satan, but the thing written. The persons who wrote, were, properly speaking, the satan, or adversary, yet it is the written document, sent by them to Ahasuerus, which is called in, for it was not them but it, which was to appear before the king as the accuser or adversary of the Jews. Who the persons were we learn from verses 7 and 8. "The people of the land weakened the hands

of the people of Judah and troubled them in building. And hired counsellors against them to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus, king of Persia." But we are told that "in the reign of Ahasuerus in the beginning of his reign," they wrote to him, and this writing is called a *satan* or *accusation*. The term *satan* then, so far from being the appropriate name of a fallen angel, is applied to men's evil passions, the angel of Jehovah, human beings, and here to a piece of writing. But not as yet, do we find it once used to designate an angel who fell from heaven.

Job 1 : 6—13. and 2 : 1—11. comes next to be considered. To save room, I forbear transcribing these two passages. The reader can easily turn to his Bible and read them. The term *satan* occurs here fourteen times, but is uniformly left untranslated. It is rendered in the Seventy's version by the word *diabolos*, devil. Here, say many good people, *satan* must mean a fallen angel—"for the name, the things said to be done, and all the circumstances mentioned, go to prove his existence and wicked character." We frankly admit, that these two passages have more the appearance of teaching this doctrine, than all the other texts usually adduced as proof of it. We even admit, that if the devil of Christians is taught in the Bible, this is the place. We hope then, that our friends are willing to abide by the result, whatever devil or *satan* this turns out to be.

I have examined these two chapters, with all the care and attention I could command, and shall submit the result for candid consideration, by stating and answering the following questions.

1st. Who wrote the book of Job? Answer; about this there are various opinions. Some have ascribed it to Job himself. Others to Elihu or one of the prophets. The general opinion has been, that it was written by Moses, and composed from materials left

by Job or his friends in the Syriac or Arabic language. See Gray's Key.

2d. When was the book of Job written? Answer; it is generally agreed that it was written sometime between the death of Joseph and the delivery of the law at Sinai. It is perhaps impossible for us to fix its precise date. Nor is this at all important as to the object of our present investigation. Those who wish to see the various opinions entertained concerning this, may consult Gray's Key, pp. 229—258.

3d. Was Job a real, or only a fictitious person? Answer; Some have held the latter opinion. I am strongly inclined to think that Job was a real person, or in after parts of scripture his afflictions are represented as real afflictions, and his patience under them as real patience, and as an example to us. He is spoken of just as Noah and Daniel are. One of the sons of Issachar is called Job, Gen. 46: 13. and was one of Jacob's grand-children, who went down with him into Egypt. If this was the person who forms the subject of the book of Job, it fixes, generally the period in which he lived.

4th. Is every thing in the book of Job to be understood literally, or is any allowance to be made for embellishment or allegorical representation? Answer; Although I think Job was a real person, yet many things are set forth in the way of allegory. For example, God is not only represented as talking with Satan, but as influenced by him to bring accumulated sufferings on a just man without cause. These are brought in such rapid succession too, as seldom occurs among men. Besides; there seems something studied and artificial, that only one servant should make his escape to tell Job what had happened, and before he is well done, only one more makes his escape to bring additional evil tidings. And just as he loses his speech, a third also in like manner, and a

fourth in the same way arrives, and closes the first scene of Job's calamities. Besides ; throughout the whole book, there is something very studied and artificial in the set speeches of Job and his friends, and even of God himself at the close. The writer gives Job just double the number of camels, oxen, sheep, and asses, without one more or less, which he had at the beginning. And he gives him precisely the same number of sons, and the same number of daughters, as at the first. And finally leaves Job in a more prosperous condition than before his afflictions came upon him, with a long life of enjoying his prosperity. The book concludes without any notice of the removal of Job's disease, which by some is called *elephantiasis*, and was deemed by physicians incurable. Had the whole been matter of fact, and nothing in it allegorical, we hardly think such artificial statements could have been given.

5th. In what part of the world, were the scenes of the book of Job laid? Answer ; we are told chap. 1 : 1. that—"there was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job." That this was in Chaldea or its neighborhood, is almost certain, for the Chaldean robbers or freebooters are said to have carried away Job's flocks, chap. 1 : 17. Dr. Parish in his Sacred Geography, says—"Bochart and the authors of the Universal History, and some others place the land of Uz far south from Damascus, and almost directly east from the tribe of Reuben, and west from Chaldea, in Arabia Deserta." But see his work on the word Uz for other opinions about this. See also Gray's Key, as referred to above. It is not of essential importance, to determine the precise spot where Job lived. It is sufficient for our purpose that he lived in the east. See Job 1 : 3.

6th. What were the religious opinions of the people where the scenes of the book are laid? Answer ;

This is a point of very great importance to ascertain. Orthodox men who certainly did not write to favor my opinions shall furnish us with all necessary information about this: Prideaux in his *Connexions*, vol. 1. pp. 185—6. thus writes: "Directly opposite to these were the Magians, another sect, who had their original in the same eastern countries; for they, abominating all images, worshipped God only by fire. They began first in Persia, and there, and in India, were the only places where this sect was propagated; and there they remain even to this day. Their chief doctrine was, that there were two principles, one which was the cause of all good, and the other the cause of all evil, that is to say, God and the devil; that the former is represented by light, and the other by darkness, as their truest symbols; and that, of the composition of these two, all things in the world are made: the good god they name Yazdan, and also Ormuzd, and the evil god, Abraman: the former is by the Greeks called Oramasdez, and the latter Arimanius. And therefore, when Xerxes prayed for that evil upon his enemies, that it might be put into the minds of all of them to drive their best and bravest men from them, as the Athenians had Themistocles, he addressed his prayer to Arimanius the evil god of the Persians, and not to Oramasdez their good god. And concerning these two gods there was this difference of opinion among them, that whereas some held both of them to have been from all eternity, there were others that contended, that the good god only was eternal, and that the other was created. But they both agreed in this, that there will be a continual opposition between these two till the end of the world; that then the good god shall overcome the evil god, and that from thenceforward each of them shall have his world to himself, that is, the good god his world with all good men with him, and the evil

god his world with all evil men with him; that darkness is the truest symbol of the evil god, and light the truest symbol of the good god. And therefore they always worshipped him before fire, as being the cause of light, and especially before the sun, as being in their opinion the perfectest fire, and causing the perfectest light. And for this reason, in all their temples, they had fire continually burning on altars erected in them for that purpose. And before these sacrifices they offered up all their public devotions, as likewise they did all their private devotions before their private fires in their own houses. Thus did they give the highest honor to light, as being in their opinion the truest representative of the good god; but always hated darkness, as being, what they thought, the truest representative of the evil god, whom they had in the utmost detestation, as we now have the devil: and, for an instance hereof, whenever they had an occasion in any of their writings to mention his name, they always wrote it backward, and inverted as thus, *uowewiqv*."

That such were the religious opinions of the people where Job lived, cannot well be doubted. In fact we should think indisputable to whatever result it may lead. Ahraman or Arimanius, the evil principle deified, was the evil god of the people. The objection which will be stated against this is—"That Job lived at too early a period for the opinions advanced in this quotation." But in answer I would mark first, that Job's day was not too early for Sabianism or the worship of idols, for this existed in Abraham's day: and when Israel entered Canaan the worship of idols prevailed among the inhabitants. Why then should his day be too early for the Magian religion? Prideaux, speaks of Sabianism, as *opposite* to Magianism, but does not intimate that the former is of a more ancient date. On the contrary, we sh

see in the next Section, that when Zoroaster arose and revived the Magian religion he revived that, which for "many ages" had been the established religion of Persia. In this account satan is not represented as a new or extraordinary being, who had never been heard of before. It is taken for granted that the people where the scenes of the book are laid, were familiar with such a being, and the opinions expressed concerning him. This account, which appears strange to us, they needed no explanation of, any more than people among us do, when any man preaches about the devil.

But what shows such opinions prevailed where Job lived, are the facts and circumstances mentioned in the account itself. These we shall notice presently. Here I would only say, that it is evident satan is introduced as an evil being, and it is generally contended that he was the author of all Job's afflictions. This perfectly agrees to the opinions of the Magians, as stated by Prideaux. Besides, previous scripture usage of the term satan, forbids us thinking, that the sacred writers recognized either an evil god or a fallen angel under this name. Where, let me ask, do any of them intimate, that an evil being, such as the Persian evil god, or the Christian's devil, existed as a rival to Jehovah? To what else then could the writer refer, but to such heathen opinions? If such a being as the Christian's devil existed, how is it accounted for, that he remained so quiet until the days of Job? Job appears to have been the first man he ever troubled, from the creation of the world. Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with many others were good men, and rich men, but he never attempted to injure them in their property, or smite them with a single boil in their whole lifetime. From any thing which appears to the contrary, they had no fear of such a being, nor knew of his existence. Had satan just

fallen from heaven, in the days of Job, and began his depredations on mankind? Admitting this true, how is it, that as Job was the first, so he was the last man he ever so tormented? The case of the woman, whom he is said to have bound eighteen years, is no exception to this, as we shall show, Section 5. Let it be accounted for then, why satan had such a particular hatred against Job, above all other men before or since. It is easily perceived, that these things are rationally accounted for, on the presumption, that in this account there is a reference to the evil god of the people among whom Job lived. Allowing this, the account is just what might be expected. The character given to satan, answers to that of their god, whom they believed to be the author and director of all evil.

The question, which now comes forward for consideration is—Was this account of satan introduced for the purpose of establishing, or was it introduced to refute such opinions? Let satan here be considered, either the evil principle deified, or the devil of Christians, were such opinions intended to be sanctioned by the writer, or does he introduce them, to expose their fallacy, and establish the supremacy of the one living and true God in opposition to them? All I think will agree, that the whole must stand approved or condemned. No middle path can be here taken, for no ground is afforded for it. It is then a matter of no consequence, whether we consider satan in this account the principle of evil deified, or, that he was the Christian's devil. Whether the same or different, I shall proceed to show, by direct and I think conclusive evidence, that neither of them had any influence in producing Job's afflictions. That they were all sent by the one living and true God, whom Job feared and obeyed, is evident.

1st. From Job's own testimony concerning his afflictions. Job's heathen neighbors supposed their evil god Ahraman was the cause of them. Christians believe their satan or devil was the cause of them. But does Job ascribe them to either? No: when one messenger after another is represented as announcing to him the loss of his property and at last the death of his children, he says—"The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord." Chap. 1: 21. He does not for a moment admit that either Ahraman or the devil had any kind of concern in his afflictions. He no more admits their influence in taking away his property and children, than in the bestowment of them. The giving and taking them away are alike ascribed to Jehovah. Similar were his views and feelings, when afflicted with sore boils. His wife desired him to curse God and die. But he says to her—"Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh.—What! Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" Job 2: 9, 10. Does this look like acknowledging the Persian evil god or the Christian's devil? Notwithstanding the popular opinions, that Ahraman was the cause of all evil, the severe bodily pain he suffered, and the taunts of his wife, he holds fast his integrity in the true God. Now, permit me to ask, if Job had believed, that either Ahraman or the devil brought his afflictions upon him, why did he ascribe them all to the true God without reservation? And why did he not correct his wife's mistake by telling her that Ahraman or the devil ought to be cursed? But Job had no faith in either, and hence he told her that she spoke as one of the *foolish* or *heathen* women speaketh. Job allowed of but one God, and it is evident, that his adversity and prosperity are both alike ascribed to him. See chap. 42: 10—12. and 1: 21.

2d. The speech of Job's wife, and his reply to her, shows, that neither Ahraman nor the devil was the cause of his afflictions. She no doubt heard what he said, ch. 1: 21. Upon seeing him still persisting in his integrity under his affliction of the boils she was provoked at him, and in taunting language says to him: "dost thou still retain thine integrity? Curse God and die." On the word rendered *to curse*, Parkhurst thus writes: "The lexicons have absurdly, and contrary to the authority of the ancient versions, given to this verb the sense of cursing in the six following passages: 1 Kings 21: 10, 13. Job 1: 5, 11. And 2: 5, 9. As to the two first the Seventy render *Berek*, in both, by *eulogo*, and so the Vulg. by *benedico*, *to bless*. And though Jezebel was herself an abominable idolatress, yet as the law of Moses still continued in force, she seems to have been wicked enough to have destroyed Naboth upon the false accusation of *blessing the heathen aleim* and Moloch, which subjected him to death, by Deut. 13: 6—12. and 17: 2—7. Job's fear, ch. 1: 5. was, lest his sons should have *blessed the false aleim*; and verse 11. he says ought to be rendered—'And indeed stretch forth thy hand now, and touch all that he hath, surely he hath blessed thee to thy face,' *i.e.* hypocritically; the verb being used in a past tense. The Seventy render it, *truly he will bless thee to thy face*. And the Vulgate—*unless he hath blessed thee to thy face*. Comp. verses 5, 7. And 1 Kings 20: 23. Satan brings the same charge of hypocrisy against Job, chap. 2: 5. which the Seventy, Theodotian, and Vulgate render in the same manner. And at verse 9. his wife says to him, *dost thou yet retain thy integrity, thy regard for the true God, blessing the aleim and dying, or even to death?*"—Thus far Parkhurst whose remarks shed additional light on this account. They agree with the usage of the word, which is rendered *to bless*, in other texts: they also accord with the

e of hypocrisy, which is brought against Job's friends throughout the book. But what particular notice, these remarks show, that ved among a people who had a false *aleim* or and a contrast, if not a contest between this god shovah is set forth in the account. The false spoken of as *one*, and not many, and what god this be but Ahraman? For the Persians had wo, their good god and their evil god. That a st, is set forth betwixt the false god and the s evident from Job's fear, chap. 1: 5, lest his en should have *blessed* the false *aleim* or god, d of *cursing* the true God as in the common ver-

It is also plain from the speech of his wife, nstead of desiring Job to curse the true God, ses her surprise, that he should continue to aim though at the point of death in suffering his hands. It is apparent, that she believed in an, and entertained the opinions concerning s stated above by Prideaux. She was dis- d with her husband, for continuing to trust in ie God at the gates of death, and even blessing r his afflictions. In desiring him to renounce nfidence in the true God, did she mean that he l become an atheist, or live without any God? he impliedly wished him to trust in Ahraman il god, the author of all evil, and the cause of afflictions. Job had despised him, and con- to trust in the true God to the last. She there- ished him to abandon this confidence, and trust evil god, the true author of his afflictions. By so, he would become his friend, remove his af- is, or terminate them by death.

That this account of satan, is introduced to be mned, and not sanctioned, appears from the ings of Job and his friends throughout the book. Job's friends, like himself, did not be-

lieve in Ahraman, for they maintain, that Jehovah, on account of his hypocrisy and wickedness, had sent such afflictions upon him. But I ask, does any one of them ever intimate that satan, whether Persian god or Christian devil, had produced his afflictions? No; they are to a man agreed, that they were the doings of Jehovah, nor do they insinuate, that he used satan as a tool in producing them. As a specimen of their sentiments on this subject, let the reader consult chap. 4 : 9. and 5 : 17, 18. and 8 : 3, 4. Job defends himself against the charge of hypocrisy and wickedness brought by his friends. See as examples chap. 6 : 4, 5. 7 : 20, 21. 9 : 16—18. 10 : 2. 16 : 11—15. and 19 : 21. We may then appeal to every candid man, whether Job's friends, would have been silent about satan producing his afflictions, if they believed so. And had they believed satan, or Ahraman the author of all evil, would they have ascribed his afflictions to Jehovah? Besides; had Job or his friends believed, that Jehovah used satan as an instrument in inflicting them, why is nothing said about it, either in their charge or his defence? In repelling their accusations, would Job have failed to urge that his afflictions arose from satan's great enmity against him, had he but suspected that this was true. All know, that people are not very scrupulous now in blaming the devil. Nothing could have been easier or more natural, than for Job to repel the charges against him by saying, that satan hated him and had thus afflicted him. Can any man then believe, that this account was introduced to establish the existence of such an evil being, yet this be contradicted by Job and his friends throughout the book? If true, why not rather go on to confirm such a doctrine? Is it objected—"if false why introduce it at all?" I answer; for the very purpose of refuting such an opinion, and for establishing the unity and supremacy of

the one living and true God. It is well known, that false gods are often introduced in Scripture, in contrast with the true, for the very purpose of exposing their absurdity. But I ask, is any false god ever allowed to be able to do good or evil? No; they are challenged to do either, to prove that they are gods. It is admitted by every intelligent man, that in the after parts of the Old Testament, and in the New, there are allusions to the evil principle deified, or the evil god of the Persians. And to darkness as the symbol of this god. See a specimen of these, and how the sacred writers expose such a doctrine, Isai. 45 : 5—7. 2 Cor. 6 : 15. 10 : 3. and 11 : 13, 14. Eph. 6 : 10.

4th. Job's afflictions are referred to, James 5 : 11. and his patience under them, is set forth as an example to us, but are not ascribed to satan but to Jehovah. Indeed no sacred writer, these two chapters excepted, say or insinuate that Ahraman or satan had any influence in producing them. But I have a right to demand, why no sacred writer has done this, if they believed as most people do now that satan was the author of Job's afflictions? If they had the same view of those two chapters as most people now have, is it possible that they would have been silent on such a subject?

5th. However prone the Jews were to idolatry, and the superstitions of the nations around them, it was a truth obviously taught in their Scriptures, that their God was good, and that he had no evil being as a rival to him. So far from giving any countenance to an evil being called Ahraman, Satan, Devil, or by any other name, all witchcraft, necromancy, or appeals to any other being or power stand condemned, and the Jews were solemnly charged to have no concern with them. Jehovah, and he alone, is declared to be the creator, preserver, and ruler of all things, and all beings in the universe. Life and death, sick-

ness and health, prosperity and adversity, are all ascribed to him. See Gen. 1 : 1. Dan. 4 : 35. 1 Sam. 2 : 6, 7. Isai. 45 : 7. Amos 3 : 6. Micah 1 : 12. Psalm 33 : 13—15. Prov. 16 : 4, 9. and 21 : 30. The idea of an evil being, which Christians call the devil and satan, and other nations have designated by a variety of names found no place in the Jewish Scriptures. That the Jews learnt such opinions from the heathen, we shall see in the next Section. In concluding our remarks on this account of satan in the book of Job, let us compare what is said in it, with the above quotation from Prideaux, and we shall see all that has been advanced strongly confirmed.

Let us begin with the term satan? We have seen that this word signifies *an adversary*. That person or thing, is called a satan to another, which stands in his way, or in any shape opposes him. Thus, the angel of Jehovah, was a satan to Baalam, and the writing sent to Ahasuerus, was a satan to the Jews. Satan, in this account, is represented as opposed both to God and Job. He was their adversary or satan. Prideaux, in the above quotation, informs us, that Abraman the evil god, was opposed to the good God, and that this opposition would continue to the end of the world. He also informs us that the evil god was considered the author and director of all evil. This, is precisely the representation, which is given of satan in the book of Job. All Job's afflictions are supposed to be the doings of satan. Orthodox people contend, that this was the case, and that satan is their devil. They have then got only an evil heathen god, or the principle of evil deified, a mere nonentity for a devil. But is this very honorable to Christianity? And is it like persons, who reverence the word of God, flatly to contradict Job, in ascribing afflictions to satan which he ascribes to Jehovah? Job contends, that the good God was the author of his

fictions, as well as his prosperity. Those who believed in the evil god, did not deny, but the good God as the author of his prosperity, but would not admit him to be the author of his adversity. Job maintained that Jehovah was the author of both, blessing his name when he took away, as well as when he gave. By this the excellency of his character was made manifest.

But again; in the above quotation from Prideaux, it is not alleged, that the good and evil gods always produced good and evil by their own immediate agency, but that these were brought about by the instrumentality of second causes. Though Job ascribes his prosperity and adversity to Jehovah, yet he, and the scripture writers represent him, as accomplished both by human means. Looking at the two first chapters of Job, the agents by which Job's afflictions were produced, are distinctly mentioned. For example, the Sabeans and Chaldean freebooters carried away his flocks. Were not they then a satan to Job, the common scripture usage of this term? And does not their very manner of life, exactly agree to what satan says, chap. 1 : 7. ? "And the Lord said to satan, whence comest thou?" Well, what answer does he make? He says, "from going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it." Just such an answer as those freebooters would have given, for it was their mode of life to roam about committing such depredations. Yea, satan is the very name given to such persons in the East to this day. Messrs. Fisk and King, two of the Palestine missionaries, thus write: "For two hours, however, we moved along our attendants were engaged in loud and violent disputes with these and other companies of Bedouins, who came up after they went away. They extorted a few dollars from the Armenians and Greeks, and at last took an ass from one of

the Arabs. Our Shekh knew all these freebooters, and it is probably owing to his acquaintance with them, and his faithfulness to us, that they were so easily satisfied, and that we met with so little trouble from them. He says, most of the Bedouins are much worse than these, and yet he called these satans (shaitan.") See Christian Spectator, vol. vii. p. 222. Such is the account given us by two orthodox missionaries.* If the writer of the book of Job, did not include the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters in the term satan, all will allow, that the ancient and present usage of this word in the East fully warranted him. We see then, that there was no need for the assistance of a fallen angel, to produce this part of Job's afflictions. The agent by which he lost his children, is as distinctly mentioned. We are told, chap. 1: 18, 19. "That a great wind from the wilderness, smote the four corners of the house, and it fell upon them and killed them." Such was the cause, which produced this effect, nor do we perceive, that the aid of any evil being was required to accomplish it. We may just as well accuse satan of blowing down every house which is destroyed by a tornado. Job's sheep were killed by lightning, and it and the wind are agents in the natural world by which God accomplishes his pleasure, over which Ahraman or the Christian's devil have no control.

Again; looking at this account, and comparing it with the quotation from Prideaux, we see why Job's boils are expressly ascribed to satan, without any other agent being concerned in their production. All evil indiscriminately, was ascribed to the evil god or satan, as all good was to the good god. But, as there was no visible agent to which the boils could be as-

* Since the above was written the painful tidings of Mr. Fisk's death have been published.

cribed, no agent in this case is mentioned. Satan, or the evil god, has to father this affliction himself, without the assistance of any agent. Hence it is said, sathan smote Job with the boils, which is not said respecting his other afflictions, though the whole aspect of the account, is in agreement with considering him the author and director of all evil. I shall only add, that it has always appeared strange, that in this account, sathan should be represented as conversing freely and familiarly with God. But if the account be as I have stated, the good and evil gods are here only represented as conversing together. It was in unison with the popular opinions concerning them.

In concluding our remarks, let us briefly notice some points of similarity in the Magian creed, to those of Christian creeds in the present day.

The Persians then had *one* good being or god, and also *one* evil being. Or, as Prideaux observes, "that is to say God and the devil." Christians in this are perfectly agreed with them, for they believe in *one* God, and also *one* devil. Again; the Persians believed, that these two gods were the authors of all good and evil in the world. In this also Christians agree with them, for all good they ascribe to God, and impute all evil to sathan or the devil. Further; the Persians made darkness the symbol of their evil god. So do Christians. When they speak of the devil he is described as black, dark, and hideous, and as loving darkness, and dwelling in darkness, and keeping men in darkness, and will lead them at last into eternal darkness. Again; the Persians believed that their good god was eternal. Some believed also, that their evil god was eternal. About this, there was a difference of opinion. So all Christians believe their God to be eternal, but about the devil there is a difference of opinion. Though none of them believe him to have been from all eternity, yet some of

them believe that he is to live forever, and shall remain eternally the same wicked being. Others of them think, that after a long period of punishment, he will be either struck out of existence, or be redeemed and made eternally happy. But again, the Persians believed, that there was a continual opposition between their good god and evil god, and that this should continue to the end of the world. Then, the good god shall overcome the evil god, and thenceforward each of them shall have his world to himself, that is, the good god his world with all good men with him, and the evil god his world with all evil men with him. All Christians contend, that there is a continual opposition between their God and the devil, and that this opposition shall continue to the end of the world. Then, God is to overcome the devil, and from that time henceforward, God is to have his world and all good men with him, and the devil is to have his world, and all wicked men with him. Such are a few of the leading points of similarity, between the ancient Magian faith and the faith of Christians in our day, respecting God, the devil, and future punishment. It is but proper and fair to notice

2d. Some of the points of dissimilarity between them. The Magians then believed, that their good and evil gods were only "two principles." These principles they not only personified, but deified and worshipped. When Xerxes prayed for evil on his enemies, "he addressed his prayer to Arimanius the evil god, and not to Ormasdes, their good god." Christians, believe their God and the devil, to be, not two principles, but two beings. Their devil is not only a being, but was once an angelic being, but for his sin and rebellion was cast out of heaven. Christians do not worship their devil. But alas, too many who profess to be Christians, like Xerxes, when they wish evil on their enemies, pray to the devil. Chris-

have a great number of names for their devil. It is apparent, that whether such a being is called Ahriman, Arimanius, satan, or devil, the leading features of his character among all nations are the same.

The evil god has become the Christian's devil. But they make their devil the worst being, for it was believed that their evil god, should at least of the world have a world to himself with all its men, yet it does not appear, that they believed him to be the eternal tormentor of men. But it is now known, that this is a principal article in most orthodox creeds, and no man would be deemed orthodox who denied it. I shall only add, that though Zoroastrians and Christians agree in hating Ahriman the devil, yet the latter have not carried their hatred so far as to write the devil's name inverted. In the next Section we shall see, that the Magian creed was much improved by Zoroaster, and that Christians have not only adopted his sentiments, but the language in which he expressed them.

Isaiah 38: 20. comes next to be considered. It says also that they render evil for good are mine *adversaries*." Here the word *satan* occurs in the plural, rendered as usual *adversaries*. It is useless to make any remarks on this text, for its context clearly shows, that David is not speaking of fallen angels but of men. In verse 19. he calls them his *enemies*, and speaks of them as lively, strong, and multiplied.

Isaiah 71: 13. "Let them be confounded and rebuked, that are adversaries to my soul." The word *satan* is also used here in the plural, and is again rendered *adversaries*. In verse 10. David calls these his *adversaries* his *enemies*, and the whole passage shows, that he is not speaking of wicked spirits but of wicked men.

Isaiah 109: 4. "For my love they are my *adversaries*." Again the word *satan* occurs in the plural form,

and is rendered *adversaries*. It is generally contended, that this psalm relates to Christ and his adversaries, or satans. It is certain, that verse 8. is quoted Acts 1. and is applied to Judas. This term occurs in several other parts of the psalm which we shall briefly notice. In verse 6. it is said "set thou a wicked man over him: and let satan stand at his right hand." Here, the word satan is left untranslated, but is rendered adversary in the margin. In the Jewish mode of parallelism, a wicked man in the first part of the verse, is the same as satan in the second. For an illustration of what is said about satan, or a wicked man *standing at his right hand when he shall be judged* in verse 7. see on Zach. 3: 1, 2. below. In verse 20. it is said—"let this be the reward of mine *adversaries* from the Lord, and of them that speak evil against my soul." The word *satan*, is here again used in the plural, and rendered *adversaries*. It is rendered in the same way, verse 29. "Let mine *adversaries* be clothed with shame, and let them cover themselves with their own confusion, as with a mantle." On the whole of this psalm, and the use of the term satan in it, we would merely remark, that no person who reads it, can suppose that there is the least reference to a fallen angel in it. It is evident, that if the psalm refers to the Messiah, Judas and the persecuting Jews are designated by the term satan; and shows us, the propriety of the terms devil and satan being applied to them in the New Testament, as we shall afterwards see.

Zach. 3: 1, 2. is the last place where the term satan occurs in the Old Testament. "And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto satan, the Lord rebuke thee, O satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked

out of the fire." Here the word *satan* is again left untranslated, except in verse 1. where it is rendered "to resist him." In the margin it is to "be his adversary." In the Seventy's version, the word *satan* is throughout this passage rendered *diabolos*. On the whole of it I remark,

1st. Let the word *satan* be only rendered *adversary* throughout these verses, and the idea of a fallen angel vanishes. The reader can easily put this remark to the trial, by substituting the term *adversary* for *satan*, in reading the passage. From our habit of associating the idea of a fallen angel with the term *satan*, and not with the word *adversary*, this and some other texts are supposed to teach such a doctrine. But can this false association establish it?

2d. If it were necessary, it could be shown, what *satan* or *adversary* was meant. Let any one read *Ezra*, chaps. 3. and 4. and notice particularly what is said concerning *Tatnai*, and *Shethar-boznai* in chap. 5. and little doubt can remain, that they were the *satan* or *adversary* referred to. It is allowed, that *Zachariah* prophesied about the time the events in the book of *Ezra* took place. Compare with this what is said on *Ezra* 4 : 6. above. If people will interpret this passage literally of a fallen angel, why not also interpret the following chapters in the same book literally. See chaps. 1, 2, 5, 6.

3d. In this passage and in *Psal.* 109 : 6. above, *Jahn* thinks there is an allusion to the forms of judicial trials in ancient times. He thus writes : "The ceremonies which were observed in conducting a judicial trial, were as follows. 1. The accuser and the accused both made their appearance before the judge or judges, *Deut.* 25 : 1. who sat with legs crossed upon the floor, which was furnished for their accommodation with carpet and cushions. A secretary was present, at least in more modern

times, who wrote down the sentence, and indeed every thing in relation to the trial; for instance, the articles of agreement, that might be entered into, previous to the commencement of the judicial proceedings, Isai. 10: 1, 2. Jer. 32: 1—14. The Jews assert that there were *two* secretaries, the one being seated to the right of the judge, who wrote the sentence of not guilty, the other to the left, who wrote the sentence of condemnation. Comp. Matth. 25: 33—46. That an apparitor or beadle was present, is apparent from other sources. 2. The accuser was denominated in Hebrew SATAN, or *the adversary*, Zach. 3: 1—3. Psalm 109: 6. The judge or judges were seated, but both of the parties implicated stood up, the accuser standing to the right hand of the accused. The latter, at least after the captivity, when the cause was one of great consequence, appeared with hair dishevelled, and in a garment of mourning."

Such are all the texts in the Old Testament, where the term *satan* occurs. The reader can now judge for himself, if it is ever used by the writers as the *name* of a fallen angel, who ruined our first parents and all their posterity.

SECTION IV.

THE OPINION, THAT THE DEVIL OR SATAN IS A REAL BEING,
WITH OTHER CONNECTED OPINIONS, SHOWN TO HAVE
THEIR ORIGIN IN HEATHENISM.

It has been shown in the two preceding Sections, that the Old Testament gives no countenance to the

common doctrine of a fallen angel, under the name serpent, satan, or any other. Indeed, we think it has been established, that the account of satan in the two first chapters of Job, was introduced for the express purpose of refuting such opinions. A very important inquiry arises, How came such opinions to be imbibed by Christians, become so current in the world, and even seem to derive countenance from the New Testament. To account for these and other things shall be our business in the present Section.

1st. In the early stages of the Jewish history, we read of witches and witchcraft. Injunctions are given against these, before we hear any thing about satan or the devil. But notice, that nothing is said to them about witchcraft until they were about to enter Canaan. Many of the injunctions delivered to the Jewish nation, were for the purpose of fortifying them against such heathen notions, and preserving them in the fear and service of the one living and true God. See the following among other passages concerning this. Levit. 19 : 26, 31. 20 : 6, 27. Deut. 18 : 9—12. Exod: 22 : 18. comp. Isai. 47 : 12, 13. 1 Sam. chap. 28. The inhabitants of Canaan were given to idolatry, and witchcraft with similar superstitions were its effects on the minds of the people. But such a being as Christians call the devil, was neither worshipped, feared, nor known among them. They had abundance of idols, but no devil or satan, nor are the Jews cautioned to beware of imbibing from them such an opinion. It is then a very great mistake, which many good people have made, in calling witchcraft the devil's art, and in thinking witches and wizzards were in league with him. Concerning this, Michaelis, on the laws of Moses, thus writes, vol. iv. page 89. "We must however entertain very different sentiments on this point, in reference to the time of Moses. For in the Biblical writings prior to the Babylonish cap-

tivity, we meet with very little notice of the devil, and it would seem, that the effects which he could produce on the material world, were considered as but very trifling. The wizzards of those days rather ascribed the efficacy of their conjurations to other gods ; and therefore, in the Israelitish polity, witchcraft was commonly accounted a species of idolatry, and of course, most severely punishable. Hence orthodox theology, in the time of Moses, could look upon it in no other light, than an imposture : for no one could maintain, that it operated preternaturally, without admitting the existence of other gods, and their power over the material world.”—The Jews before they entered Canaan knew nothing about the devil. Nor did its idolatrous inhabitants, for he was not known in that part of the world. If then, as now, he walked about seeking whom he might devour, it is very unaccountable he should not be familiarly known in Canaan, a land full of idols, and witches, and all manner of wickedness. It seems all these could exist in those days without any devil to produce them. Nor is Moses, or rather God, under any apprehension, that he would visit that country. We shall see that the Jews were obliged to go to a foreign land to find the devil.

2d. The Jews were carried to Babylon, and spent seventy years in captivity. Here, the Magian religion, revived and improved by Zoroaster, prevailed, and here we shall find that they became acquainted with the doctrine of the devil, and with other religious opinions not found in their scriptures. To this point I shall now turn the attention of the reader. Prideaux, vol. i. p. 219—240. gives us an account of Zoroaster, his religion, and its success, a few brief extracts from which I shall only make. He says—“ In the time of his (Darius Hystaspis) reign first appeared in Persia the famous prophet of the Magians,

whom the Persians call Zerdusht, or Zaratush, and the Greeks, Zoroaster. He was the greatest impostor, except Mahomet, that ever appeared in the world, and had all the craft and enterprising boldness of that Arab, but much more knowledge; for he was excellently skilled in all the learning of the East that was in his time; whereas the other could neither read nor write; and particularly he was thoroughly versed in the Jewish religion, and in all the sacred writings of the Old Testament that were then extant, which makes it most likely, that he was as to his origin, a Jew. And it is generally said of him, that he had been a servant to one of the prophets of Israel, and that it was by this means that he came to be so well skilled in the Holy Scriptures, and all other Jewish knowledge; which is a further proof that he was of that people; it not being likely, that a prophet of Israel should entertain him as a servant, or instruct him as a disciple, if he were not of the same seed of Israel, as well as of the same religion with him; and that especially since it was the usage of that people, by principle of religion, as well as by long received custom among them, to separate themselves from all other nations, as far as they were able. And it is further to be taken notice of, that most of those who speak of his original, say, that he was of Palestine, within which country the land of Judea was. And all this put together, amounts with me to a convincing proof that he was first a Jew, and that by birth, as well as religion, before he took upon him to be prophet of the Magian sect.

“He did not found a new religion, as his successor in imposture, Mahomet did, but only took upon him to revive and reform an old one, that of the Magians, which had been for many ages past the ancient national religion of the Medes, as well as of the Persians: for it having fallen into disgrace on the death

of those ringleaders of that sect, who had usurped the sovereignty after the death of Cambyses, and the slaughter which was then made of all the chief men among them, it sunk so low, that it became almost extinct, and Sabianism every where prevailed against it, Darius and most of his followers on that occasion going over to it. But the affection which the people had for the religion of their forefathers, and which they had been all brought up in, not being easily to be rooted out, Zoroaster saw that the revival of this was the best game of imposture that he could then play; and, having so good an old stock to graft upon, he did with the greater ease make all his new scions to grow which he inserted into it.

“The chief reformation which he made in the Magian religion was in the first principle of it: for whereas before they had held the being of two first causes, the first light, or the good god, who was the author of all good; and the other darkness, or the evil god, who was the author of all evil; and that of the mixture of these two, as they were in a continual struggle with each other, all things were made; he introduced a principle superior to them both, one supreme God, who created both light and darkness, and out of these two, according to the alone pleasure of his own will made all things else that are, according to what is said in the 45th chapter of Isaiah, 5, 6, 7. “I am the Lord, and there is none else: there is no God besides me; I girded thee, though thou hast not known me, that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none besides me. I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and create evil, I the Lord do all these things.” For these words being directed to Cyrus, king of Persia, must be understood as spoken in reference to the Persian sect of the Magians, who then held light and darkness, or

good and evil, to be the supreme beings, without acknowledging the great god who is superior to both. And I doubt not it was from hence that Zoroaster had the hint of mending this great absurdity in their theology. But to avoid making God the author of evil, his doctrine was, that God originally and directly created only light or good, and that darkness or evil followed it by consequence, as the shadow doth the person; that light or good had only a real production from God, and the other afterwards resulted from it, and the defect thereof. In sum, his doctrine as to this particular was, that there was one supreme Being independent and self-existing from all eternity. That under him there were two angels, one the angel of light, who is the author and director of all good; and the other the angel of darkness, who is the author and director of all evil; and that these two, out of the mixture of light and darkness, made all things that are; that they are in a perpetual struggle with each other; and that where the angel of light prevails, there the most is good, and where the angel of darkness prevails, there the most is evil; that this struggle shall continue to the end of the world; that then there shall be a general resurrection, and a day of judgment, wherein just retribution shall be rendered to all according to their works; after which the angel of darkness, and his disciples, shall go into a world of their own, where they shall suffer in everlasting darkness the punishments of their evil deeds; and the angel of light, and his disciples, shall also go into a world of their own, where they shall receive in everlasting light the reward due unto their good deeds; and that after this they shall remain separated forever, and light and darkness be no more mixed together to all eternity. And all this the remainder of that sect, which is now in Persia and India, do without

any variation, after so many ages, still hold even to this day."

On these extracts, and other things stated in the pages referred to, I shall make a few general remarks. Zoroaster being a Jew, well acquainted with the Jewish scriptures, and skilled in all the learning of the East, was preeminently qualified for the game of imposture which he played. He did not invent a new religion, but only revived and improved the ancient Magian religion. As Prideaux says—"He grafted all his new scions on this old stock and they grew." The Magian religion "had been for many ages past the ancient national religion of the Medes as well as of the Persians." Zoroaster's improved system soon became popular, national, and generally universal in the East. Though at first, it met with great opposition from the Sabians, yet he soon drew over to it Darius, whose example was soon followed by the "courtiers, nobility, and all the great men of the kingdom." The time in which he flourished—"was while Darius Hystaspis was king of Persia." The sect flourished from his time, which, to "the death of Yazdejard, the last Persian king of the Magian religion, was about eleven hundred years. But after the Mahometans had overrun Persia, in the seventh century after Christ, the Archimagus was forced to remove from thence into Kerman, which is a province in Persia, lying upon the Southern Ocean, towards India, and there it hath continued even to this day." But for these and other important statements I must generally refer to Prideaux's account. Malte Brun says this sect exists in Africa, and that in Congo—"The good principle is named Zamba M'Poonga; and the evil principle which is opposed to him, Cad-dee M'Peemba." Geog. B. 68. pp. 274. 328. Impostor as Zoroaster was, he did not choose to make "God the author of evil." His conscience appears

to have been more scrupulous than that of some Christians, who say, God positively hardened Pharaoh's heart, and that he influences men to sin. To avoid this *absurdity* he held "that God originally and directly created only light or good, and that darkness or evil followed it by consequence, as the shadow doth the person: that light or good had only a real production from God, and the other afterwards resulted from it as the defect thereof." But, we shall notice some of the articles of Zoroaster's creed, more immediately connected with our present subject, and compare them with the articles found in Christian creeds of the present day.

1st. Zoroaster taught, that under the supreme God "there were two angels, one the angel of light, who is the author and director of all good, and the other the angel of darkness, who is the author and director of all evil." It is very evident that his "angel of darkness," answers to the devil of Christians, for they believe their devil to be the author and director of all evil. They believe he was its author at first in deceiving Eve, and has been its author and director ever since. Both moral and physical evil are ascribed to him. The resemblance between them, is not only evident as it respects the powers and qualities both are said to possess, but the very name given to them. It is well known, that Christians call their devil, "the angel of darkness." Between Zoroaster's "angel of darkness," and the devil of Christians, I can perceive little or no difference. If there be any, we should be glad to see it pointed out. The Magians first deified the principle of evil, then Zoroaster changed this god into an angel of darkness, and Christians have adopted him for their devil; and lest his origin should be lost in the lapse of ages, have called him by the same name. But the resemblance is further manifest, by considering, that the angel of light and the angel of

darkness "are in a perpetual struggle with each other; and that where the angel of light prevails, there the most is good, and where the angel of darkness prevails, there the most is evil; and that this struggle shall continue to the end of the world." I ask all candid Christians, if this is not what they believe concerning their devil? Is it not their faith and their phraseology, that God and the devil are in a perpetual struggle? That this struggle shall continue between them unto the end of the world, and that God finally shall overcome the devil? Who can deny all this? And what Christian man can have the face to deny that Christians have made a devil out of Zoroaster's angel of darkness, for it was impossible he could make his angel of darkness out of their devil. It is also apparent, that Christians believe as Zoroaster has taught them, "that where the angel of light or the good God prevails, there the most is good, and where the angel of darkness, or their devil prevails, there the most is evil." Prideaux, considers it a great absurdity in the ancient Magian religion, that "light and darkness, or good and evil were the supreme beings, without acknowledging the great good God who is superior to both." But is the absurdity much less among Christians, in holding to one supreme God, and a devil whom they make but little inferior to him? It is true, they have not two gods in name, for they do not believe in the devil as a god. But what signifies a mere name, when in fact they ascribe to him all the characteristics of a God, yea, the very same as the ancient Magians ascribed to their evil god, and Zoroaster to his angel of darkness. Their devil struggles with the true god, and is in a continual struggle with him, and is not to give it up until the end of the world. In all past ages, they say that their devil has had the ascendancy in this strug-

gle, for evil hitherto has most prevailed. See Mr. Emerson's treatise on the Millennium.

I would suggest it for consideration, whether Zoroaster's "angel of light," is not a corruption of the Scripture doctrine concerning the Messiah. He is called the angel of the Lord, and the angel of the covenant. Between him and the seed of the serpent there is a continual struggle, and this struggle is to continue to the end of the world, when all things shall be subdued to him. But, though he was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, yea, through death to destroy the devil, this devil was not a "fallen angel," or "an angel of darkness," or "an evil god," as we shall see Section 6. Paul, 2 Cor. 11: 14. seems to allude to this tenet of Zoroaster's creed, in saying, satan is transformed into "*an angel of light.*" It is implied, that before this transformation he was "*an angel of darkness,*" which are the very expressions used by Zoroaster. See on this text, Section 5.

2d. Let us now consider, what Zoroaster says shall take place at the end of the world, and compare it with the creeds of most Christians. He says—"then there shall be a general resurrection." This article Zoroaster no doubt learned from his acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures, for the resurrection from the dead, was the ultimate hope of believers in Christ, who was promised to the fathers. At this resurrection, he says there shall be "a day of judgment." This, Zoroaster could not learn from the Old Testament, for it does not teach such a doctrine, and when he made his creed, the New was not in existence. The phrase "*day of judgment,*" used by him, is that now used by Christians, and in the same sense as he used it. In my answer to Mr. Sabine, I examined every text in which this phrase is found, and showed, that it is not once used in the Bible, in the sense which Zoroaster and Christians have attached to

it. To it I beg leave to refer the reader, who inclines to examine this subject. Christians must have borrowed the sense they attach to the phrase "day of judgment" from his creed, for he could not borrow it from theirs, as the chronology of the cases show. But let us hear Zoroaster, about what shall take place at the day of judgment? He says—"just retribution shall be rendered to all according to their works." It cannot be denied, that this is the very sentiment and language of Christian creeds. But I ask, how Zoroaster could learn either this sentiment or its phraseology from the Old Testament? If he did, intelligent and learned orthodox men have erred greatly in admitting that this doctrine is not taught at all, or at least very doubtfully in the Old Testament. Jahn, in his *Archæology*, thus writes, p. 398.—"We have not authority, therefore, decidedly to say, that any other motives were held out to the ancient Hebrews to pursue the good and avoid the evil, than those, which were derived from the rewards and punishments of this life. That *these* were the motives which were presented to their minds in order to influence them to pursue a right course of conduct, is expressly asserted, *Isai.* 26: 9, 10. and may be learnt also from the imprecations, which are met with, in many parts of the Old Testament. The *Mehes-tani*, who were disciples of Zoroaster, believed in the immortality of the soul, in rewards and punishments after death, and in the resurrection of the body; at the time of which resurrection, all the bad would be purged by fire, and associated with the good. *Zend. Avesta*, P. I. p. 107, 108. P. II. p. 211, 227, 229. 124, 125. 173, 245, 246. *Comp. Ezek.* 37: 1—14."

According to this writer, "the ancient Hebrews" were not taught the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. But he honestly tells us that the "disciples

of Zoroaster believed in the immortality of the soul, in rewards and punishments after death." It is true, the Andover translator of Jahn's work, in the paragraph preceding, inserts the following words in correction of his author. ["And although he (Solomon) no where in express terms holds up the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, informs us in chap. 12: 14. of something very much like it, viz. '*That God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether good or evil.*'"] Such is the proof adduced in opposition to Jahn, of future rewards and punishments. Our readers can judge for themselves as to its conclusiveness. It leaves one serious difficulty unrelieved. How came Zoroaster and his disciples to speak so explicitly about this doctrine, if it was not clearly revealed in the Old Testament? No Christian can speak of it with more plainness than they did, if Prideaux and Jahn in the above quotations speak truth concerning them. Christians now, use their very language, in expressing their ideas on the subject. With pleasure we acknowledge our obligations to Mr. Upham, for his translation of Jahn's valuable work, and this obligation would have been much increased, had he referred us to the parts of the Old Testament from which Zoroaster could so clearly learn his doctrine and language concerning future punishment. Or, if he could not, account for this impostor's knowing much more about it than the inspired writers. According to Jahn's account, Zoroaster's disciples did not believe in endless punishment. At "the resurrection, all the bad would be purged by fire, and associated with the good" was their belief, and this accords with the opinions of some Christians in the present day.

But, let us hear Zoroaster, about what is to succeed this day of judgment and retribution. He says—
"After which the angel of darkness, and his disciples,

shall go into a world of their own, where they shall suffer in everlasting darkness the punishment of their evil deeds; and the angel of light and his disciples, shall also go into a world of their own, where they shall receive in everlasting light the reward due unto their good deeds; and that after this they shall remain separated forever; and light and darkness be no more mixed together to all eternity." We have seen that Zoroaster's "angel of darkness," and "the devil" of Christians, are the same both as to qualities and name. Here the sameness is still more manifest, for what honest man can deny, that Christians have adopted his very sentiments and language. For example, Zoroaster's "angel of darkness" had disciples. Well, Christians say their devil has disciples. His angel of darkness with his disciples, after the day of judgment shall go into a world of their own. So say Christians concerning their devil and his disciples. His angel of darkness with his disciples, in this world of their own, "shall suffer in everlasting darkness the punishment of their evil deeds." And do not Christians say the very same of their devil and his disciples? Every orthodox man must believe that the devil with his disciples, or all wicked men, are to suffer in a world of their own "in everlasting darkness the punishment of their evil deeds," and that "the angel of light, and his disciples, shall also go into a world of their own, where they shall receive in everlasting light the reward due unto their good deeds: and that after this they shall remain separated forever, and light and darkness be no more mixed together to all eternity." What man would be deemed orthodox, who refused to believe these things? And why not allow, that Zoroaster, the greatest impostor that ever arose, Mahomet excepted, was in these things as orthodox as they are. In these things he was orthodox long before them. There is only one

of the above articles about which they differ from him in opinion. To the honor of our orthodox brethren be it spoken, they do not say, that the disciples of the angel of light receive future blessedness as a reward for good deeds done by them here. No, they say, it is not of works but of grace, lest any man should boast. It is true, the grace whereby they save men, is rather a purchased grace, than free grace, but on this I forbear remarking.

But it is added by Prideaux—"and all this the remainder of that sect which is now in Persia and India, do without any variation, after so many ages still hold even to this day." If they hold all the above articles, "without any variation to this day," and if they are all true, as Dean Prideaux asserts, why be at so much trouble and expense to send them missionaries? The chief articles in modern Christian creeds were propagated there many ages before the Christian religion existed. If these tenets were taken from the New Testament, it is certain Zoroaster taught them long before, and Jesus Christ and his apostles had not the honor of revealing such articles of faith to the world. For example, "they believe in one Supreme God, and in Jesus Christ under the name of 'an angel of light.' They believe also in the Christian's devil, under the name of 'an angel of darkness.' They believe in the opposition of these two to each other, and which is to continue to the end of the world. They further believe in a resurrection of all the dead, a day of judgment and future retribution. And they believe in the everlasting happiness of all the good, and everlasting punishment of all the wicked." Pray, what more do orthodox people wish them to believe, to be as orthodox as themselves? What more could missionaries teach them, to perfect their Christian creed, which they received from Zoroaster? It is true, there are some articles in the Christian creeds

of which they must be ignorant as they were not taught by Zoroaster. It does not appear that he knew any thing about hell-fire, as the place of everlasting punishment for his angel of darkness and his disciples. Nor had he learned that his angel of darkness was to be the everlasting tormentor of the wicked in this place. He was also ignorant that hell was paved with the skulls of infants a span long. His creed does not recognize, neither, that it is necessary for people to be willing to be damned for the glory of God, in order to their being saved. As to his making God the author of evil or sin, he framed his system so as to avoid this absurdity. Being damned for Adam's transgression, divine retribution, three persons in one God, and other articles of modern theological discussion, Zoroaster seems to have known no more about, than about captain Symmes' theory of the earth. It deserves the serious consideration of the whole orthodox body, whether missionaries ought not to come from Persia and India here, to examine into the innovations and additions made in the creed of their founder, the great Zoroaster. But I must leave this, and other reflections arising from the above statements to be made by the reader.

We have now noticed some of the principal articles of Zoroaster's creed, and would ask every candid Christian the following questions. Where did Zoroaster learn that under the supreme God there were two angels, one the angel of light, and the other the angel of darkness, who is the author and director of all evil? When did the supreme God delegate his power to two angels, and out of the mixture of light and darkness they made all things that are? And where did Zoroaster learn, that where the angel of light prevails, there the most is good, and where the angel of darkness prevails, there the most is evil? Is it not plain, that he changed the good and evil gods

of the ancient Magian religion into two angels, and called one the angel of light, and the other the angel of darkness? But does a change of names alter the nature of things? But I ask further, where did Zoroaster learn, that at the resurrection, there is to be 'a day of judgment' wherein just retribution shall be rendered to all according to their works? And where did he learn, that after the resurrection and day of judgment, "the angel of darkness, and his disciples shall go into a world of their own, where they shall suffer in everlasting darkness the punishment of their evil deeds?" Brethren, from what divine source did this arch impostor learn all these articles of his creed?—1st. Was it from the Old Testament scriptures? This you will not affirm, for intelligent orthodox men allow, that it does not contain such articles. If it does contain them, then, you can find them there as well as Zoroaster, and we call on you to prove them from this book. 2d. Did Zoroaster learn such articles from the New Testament? This was impossible, for it was not in existence for more than six hundred years after the days of Zoroaster. 3d. Did Zoroaster learn them from God, when he pretended God spoke to him out of the midst of the fire? This cannot be affirmed unless you admit him to be a true prophet of the Lord. But he is declared the greatest impostor which ever arose, Mahomet excepted. 4th. Did Zoroaster invent these articles of his creed? No other alternative is left, but to admit this, or prove that he derived them from the Old Testament, or by special revelation from God. If he invented them, then he was the author of some of the principal articles of your creeds. This we think is indisputable. 5th. Do you say, your articles, so similar to his creed, were neither derived from him, nor from the Old Testament, but entirely from the New? This will not do, for even allowing

such articles to be clearly taught in the New Testament, it is evident Jesus Christ and his apostles had not the honor of first revealing them to the world.—Zoroaster the arch impostor had revealed them, and published them all over the East, six hundred years before Christ appeared. If such articles are found in the New Testament, Jesus Christ and his apostles were indebted to this impostor for inventing them. Should you say, that Jesus Christ and his apostles derived these articles from God by immediate revelation, permit me then to ask, who revealed them to Zoroaster six hundred years before the Christian era? Did God reveal them to him? If he did, why not allow him to have been a true prophet of the Lord? And why not frankly own, that Jesus Christ and his apostles did not first reveal such articles of faith to the world, but that God first revealed them through his great prophet Zoroaster? Perhaps you may say, such articles were communicated by inspiration to Christ and his apostles, and it is on their authority that you believe them. Beware, I beseech you, of taking this ground, for this is saying, Zoroaster, a notorious impostor, invented articles of faith, which, six hundred years after their invention, God sanctioned as divine revelation. Was God indebted to an impostor for suggesting to him a religious creed suited to the Christian dispensation? For the honor of God, of Christ, and his apostles, yea, for the honor of Christianity, we hope you will not assert this. If Zoroaster learnt such articles of his creed from a divine source, it must have been from the Old Testament. But few will be found who will assert that it contains them, for this ground is abandoned by some orthodox intelligent men, and their defence is drawn from the New Testament. But if their defence can be made from the Old, we request the different articles be distinctly taken up and proved from

it. Please give book, chapter and verse, from which Zoroaster could learn them. Dan. 12: 2. is the most plausible text which can be adduced, from which he could learn the doctrine of endless punishment. This passage will be fully considered in the Second Part, to which I refer the reader. As to satan being a fallen angel, who deceived Eve, tormented Job, and has become the Christian's devil, we leave all to form their own opinion from the evidence which has been adduced.

Let it now be remembered that while the Jews dwelt in Canaan they knew nothing about the devil. If they did, it was merely by report, that the Persians and other nations believed in such a being. They had precepts, guarding them against witchcraft, idolatry, and all the abominations of the Canaanites, but not one guarding them against that almost infinite being whom Christians call the devil. How our orthodox brethren account for this I am unable to say. On my views, it is easily and rationally accounted for. The devil was the principle of evil deified, transformed by Zoroaster into an angel of darkness, and the Jews must go to Babylon to get acquainted with him. That the Jews spent seventy years in captivity there, is a fact disputed by no one. The question which then comes forward for consideration is—*Did the Jews imbibe, during their captivity, and did they bring back from it any religious opinions which were not taught in their sacred books? Were any of those opinions derived from the creed of Zoroaster, and was that now entertained concerning the devil of this number?* To see how this matter stands, we solicit the reader's attention to the following particulars.

1st. The Magian religion for many ages had been the "national religion of the Medes as well as of the Persians," as stated by Prideaux. About the time the Jews were in captivity in Babylon, Zoroaster flour-

ished there, in reviving and improving it. Jahn, p. 391. thus writes respecting the time when the Jews were carried there. "When at length admonitions ceased to be of any great avail, and every thing was growing worse and worse, the *Israelitish* commonwealth was overthrown, 253 years after their separation from Judah, and 722 before Christ. The people were carried away by the Assyrians into Gozan, Chalacene, the cities of Media, and into Assyria. The kingdom of Judah was overthrown 387 years after the separation, 588 before Christ, by the Chaldeans, and the people were carried captive to the banks of the river Chebar, in Babylonia." Prideaux says, vol. i. p. 65. that the Jews were carried to Babylon in the 4th year of Jehoiakim, which according to his chronology was six hundred and six years before Christ. It was not for want of a fair opportunity, if the Jews did not imbibe opinions not found in their Scriptures.

2d. When they were carried to Babylon no particular place was appointed for them, but they appear to have been dispersed throughout the provinces of that vast empire. It was not with the Jews here, as with their forefathers in Egypt, a particular spot being assigned them, where they lived all together, and could fortify each other against a departure from the religion of Jehovah. Their dispersed condition rendered them liable to forget their own religion, and insensibly imbibe the opinions of those among whom they lived.

3d. The very religion of Zoroaster had many things about it calculated to lead Jews to embrace it. It recognized the first principle of their own, the supremacy of one God; was the religion of the king, his court, and of all the nobility. It was popular throughout the whole empire. These, and other things noticed by Prideaux, which I forbear particu-

nizing, all concurred to make the religion of Zoroaster very fascinating to the Jews. For them to oppose it was only to render themselves as odious there, as I am likely to be among orthodox people here, in opposing their doctrine concerning the devil. Jahn, in his *Archæology*, thus writes, p. 393—4: "The similitude, which existed between the system of Moses, and that of Zoroaster, which prevailed in Persia and Media, may be summed up in a single article, viz. that they both discountenanced the worship of *idols*. or, 1. That original beginning of all things, called *HAZARUAM*, was neither the creator nor governor of the world, but the *endless succession of time*, which was presented by Zoroaster, as the supreme existence, or, as, or fountain of being. From *Hazaruam*, proceeded *Ormuz* and *Ahrimanes*. *Ormuz* acted the part of creator of the world; a circumstance which caused a little envy in the mind of *Ahrimanes*, and induced him to mingle with the workmanship of *Ormuz*, the seeds or principles of evil, which exist. By the *Mehestani*, moreover, or followers of Zoroaster, not only *Ormuz*, but six *AMSCHASPANDI*, also innumerable spirits, dispersed every where, the sun, moon, stars, and other earthly existences, were worshipped without distinction. 2. If the example of the Medes and Persians, who worshipped *Ormuz* as the creator and governor of the world, confirmed the Hebrews in the worship of *Jehovah*, it was equally likely, on the other hand, to induce them to adore the stars, and spirits, which occupied so conspicuous a place in the system of those nations; also the horses and chariot of the sun, which the ancestors of king *Josiah*, influenced by the example of the *Mehestani*, had introduced at Jerusalem, and perhaps, to practise that species of Magian worship, witnessed by *Ezekiel* in the temple of Jerusalem."

4th. The Jews previous to the captivity, had been preparing themselves in the school of superstition and wickedness, for embracing such opinions at Babylon. Jahn says, p. 392. "During the period immediately preceding their overthrow, every kind of superstition, and every moral pollution prevailed in both kingdoms, especially in that of Judah. No other means therefore remained to correct their vices, but that of extreme severity, by which their whole nation, dispersed from their country into distant regions, and humbled and afflicted, might learn that they could do nothing without God, and that idols could lend them no assistance."

5th. The long duration of their captivity, unavoidably led to the adoption of such opinions in religion. It was known by the Jews, that their captivity was to be for seventy years, and were desired to make their temporal arrangements accordingly. See the prophets' injunctions about this. But let us suppose, what is hardly supposable, that all the persons who went to Babylon over twenty years of age, were proof against imbibing any false opinion. Suffer me to ask, how were all under that age, and all born there to be preserved? Without a constant miracle they could not and no one affirms that a miracle was wrought to preserve them. It is then morally certain, that the Jews on their return, must bring back with them many of the religious opinions of the people among whom they had lived: unless we can prove, that they changed all their religious opinions, as easily as a man can shift his clothing.

6th. Prideaux shows from the Old Testament Scriptures, that some of the Jews had gone over to the Magian religion. He refers to Ezek. 8: 16. where the prophet being carried in vision to Jerusalem, saw "about five and twenty men standing between the

porch and the altar, with their backs towards the temple of the Lord, and their faces towards the east; and they worshipped the sun. The meaning of which is, that they had turned their backs upon the true worship of God, and had gone over to that of the Magians." Here then is direct proof of the fact from Scripture, that Zoroaster's religion was not only imbibed, but the worship it enjoined practised by the Jews. But as very little of the Old Testament was written after the captivity, we observe,

7th. That learned men agree that the Jews brought back from their captivity religious opinions, not taught in their Scriptures. I shall only quote the following writers in proof. Michaelis, on the laws of Moses, vol. ii. p. 348. thus writes: "In the New Testament, indeed, and in the Jewish language after the period of the Babylonish captivity, from which the Israelites returned much enriched in names for the Devil, *Belial* means the devil. But in the Old Testament it never has this meaning." Again; L'Enfant, in his introduction to the reading of the Scriptures, p. 14. thus writes: "But this much is certain, that from that time (of Alexander the Great) the Jews began to *Hellenize*; that the Greek tongue, spoken by the *Macedonians*, became more common among them, and that they also introduced some of the opinions of the Greek philosophers, as the transmigration of souls, for instance. We find some steps of this notion even in the New Testament, as in Luke 16: 23. where there is an account of the abode of departed souls, conformable to the *Grecian philosophy*, and in John 9: 2. where we find an allusion to the *pre-existence* and *transmigration* of souls. It is moreover evident from the Apocryphal writings, from Philo, Josephus, and the Talmudists, that the Jews, especially the Pharisees, had learned and followed the Grecian philosophy ever since their conversing with the Greeks under

Alexander the Great, the Ptolemies, and Seleucide his successors, who reigned in Egypt and Syria.” Those who wish to see more authorities in proof of this point may consult Dr. Campbell’s 6th Dissertation, part i. sect. 19. quoted in my First Inquiry, chap. i. sect. 3. See also Jahn’s *Archae.* p. 235. 396. The Jews then had two sources from which they derived opinions in religion not taught in their Scriptures: the opinions of Zoroaster, and those of the Greek philosophers.

8th. What conclusively proves, that the Jews brought back from their captivity many opinions not learned from their sacred books, are the Apocryphal writings. The books called Apocrypha, though not canonical, are allowed to be the best writings extant, relative to the Jews after the captivity. To these I shall now call the attention of the reader, collecting from them, what were the religious opinions of the Jews in the times to which they relate. Let us consider

1st. What were their opinions respecting *evil beings or spirits*? We shall begin with their use of the term *satan*. It occurs only in Eccles. 21 : 27. It is doubtful what idea the writer attached to this word. The word *diabolos* occurs frequently in the original, but is rendered slanderer, accusation, &c. in the English version. See Eccles. 19 : 15. 26 : 5. 28 : 9. 38 : 19. and 51 : 2. 1 Mac. 1 : 36. 2 Mac. 14 : 27. The only place where it is rendered *devil*, and which has a connexion with our present subject, is Wisdom of Solomon, 2 : 24. “Nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world: and they that do hold of his side do find it.” The allusion here is to Genesis 3. and from this passage Christians have derived the idea that it was the devil that deceived Eve. If they can show a better source for this opinion, we hope it will be done. Paul says, death en-

tered by sin, Rom. 5 : 12. and it was shown, Sect. 2. that no Old Testament writer intimates that death entered by the devil. Where then did the Apocryphal writers get this opinion? It must have been from the heathen, and it is evident this idea agrees to Zoroaster's angel of darkness, who was the author and director of all evil, death not excepted. In the Apocrypha *evil spirits* are frequently mentioned. What child has not been amused with the account of "Asmodeus the evil spirit" killing Sara's seven husbands? Also, of Raphael curing Tobit's eyes, and binding Asmodeus. And of the wonderful efficacy of the heart, liver and gall of a fish, which leaped out of the Tigris, the smoke of which smelled by the evil spirit, he fled into the utmost parts of Egypt, where the angel bound him. See Tobit, chaps. 3. 6. 8. 11. In Baruch 4 : 7. 35. we read of devils, but the original word is not *diabolos* but *daimonion*, the same which is rendered so in the New Testament. But as it is admitted on all hands, that demons, and the being Christians call the devil, are very different, it requires no attention from me in the present investigation. I would only remark in passing, that people's notions about satan, the devil, evil spirits, witches and wizzards must be from a heathen source, for none of them are admitted to be real beings in the Old Testament. On the contrary they are there condemned as superstitions, and the Jews commanded to give no heed to them. Where then could the Jews learn such opinions but from their intercourse with the heathen? If the Jews imbibed the idea of witches in Canaan, and that of the devil and evil spirits at Babylon, and such beings are mentioned in the Apocrypha, are these sufficient reasons for our believing their existence? And is it possible that such beings can be recognized as real in the New Testament?

2d. What are the opinions taught in the Apocrypha about *Hell*? The Greek word *Hades*, rendered hell, occurs, Eccles. 21 : 10. and 51 : 5, 6. Song of the three children, verse 66. Tobit 13 : 2. 2 Esd. 4 : 8. 8 : 53. and 2 : 29. It is the same word which is frequently rendered hell in the New Testament, and is synonymous with Sheol, also rendered hell in the Old. The word Gehenna, also rendered hell in the New Testament, does not occur in any of the books of the Apocrypha. By hell, in all the above texts, seems meant the same as Sheol, the grave, or state of the dead. The idea of a place of endless punishment, does not appear to be meant in any one of them. Indeed such a place of punishment could not be learned by the Jews, either from the ancient Magian religion or from Zoroaster's improvements of it, for not a word is said about hell in either. I have shown, in my Inquiry into the words Sheol, &c. that Hades or hell as a place of future punishment was learned by the Jews from their intercourse with the Greeks. See chap. i. sect. 3.

3d. What were ~~the~~ opinions of the Apocryphal writers, concerning the number that should be saved? Their opinion was that all men "shall not be saved." See 2 Esdras 8 : 38—42. On the contrary, the Most High—"made this world for many, but the world to come for few." See 2 Esd. 8 : 1. And in verse 3. it is said—"there be many created, but few shall be saved." And chap. 9 : 15. "there be many more of them which perish, than of them which shall be saved." No sentiment like this is to be found in the Magian creed, or in its improvements by Zoroaster, so far as my knowledge of them extends. Where the Apocryphal writers learned it I am unable to say with certainty; but Whitby on Rom. 2. shows that the Jews in our Lord's day, believed that none but Jews were to be saved, and they were all to be

saved. See this quotation from Whitby in my first inquiry. They believed that all the Gentiles were fuel for hell-fire. My opinion is, that this idea originated among the Jews, from their hatred of the Gentiles, and the high opinion which they entertained of themselves as the seed of Abraham. See Matth. ch. 3. No one we think will contend, that they learned such an opinion from their Scriptures. Christians in time past, have not only believed that few will be saved, but they express themselves pretty much in the language of the Apocryphal writers on the subject. Of late, Dr. Woods, Mr. Emerson, and some other orthodox writers aver, that the greater part of the human race will be saved. The number, who shall suffer eternal punishment, will not be more in proportion to the whole human race, than those who suffer capital punishment in any country, are to that of the whole community. We ought not to despise the day of small things. But this is a great thing, for not long ago, it was the orthodox faith, that comparatively few of the human race would be saved.

4th. What were the opinions of the Apocryphal writers concerning immediate punishment after death? That they believed the wicked were punished after death is evident from 2 Esdras, 7: 47. And that it commenced immediately after death seems also evident from verse 56. and 9: 12. Compare also Eccles. 18: 22—25. This is precisely the doctrine of immediate punishment after death taught in our day. But I would ask, from what source did the Apocryphal writers learn this doctrine? Not from the Old Testament scriptures, for it is now conceded by intelligent orthodox men that the Old Testament does not teach it. It was impossible they could learn it from the New, for when they wrote, it was not in existence. Not from Zoroaster's creed, for I

do not find that his creed contained the doctrine of immediate punishment after death. Where could the Jews then learn such a doctrine? I answer, from the Greeks, from whom also they learned that *Hades* or *Hell* was the place where this punishment was to be suffered. See Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c. chap. i. sect. 3. The Old Testament writers, so far from teaching the doctrine of immediate punishment after death, describe this state, as a state of darkness, silence, insensibility, and that there the very best of men cannot praise God or give him thanks. Nor is a single individual, ever represented as in pain or misery in this state. But the Greeks, from whom they learned this doctrine, believed in immediate happiness as well as misery after death, and the Apocryphal writers believed both. See Eccles. 1: 13. 2 Esdras, 14: 34. and 7: 28, 35. 2 Mac. 7: 14. Wisdom of Sol. chap. 2. See Jahn's Arch. p. 398, quoted above.

5th. What were the opinions entertained by the writers of the Apocrypha concerning "*the day of judgment*?" The phrase, "the day of judgment," only occurs once in the Old Testament, Prov. 6: 34. where no one ever supposed it referred to a day of general judgment at the end of this world. But in this sense, the phrase, "the day of judgment" is used by Zoroaster in his creed. And in this sense also it is used by the Apocryphal writers; 2 Esdras, 12: 34. Esther, 1: 11. That they meant a day of judgment after the resurrection of the dead seems evident from the following passages. The torment of the wicked at this period they believed to be—"fire and worms in their flesh; and they shall feel them, and weep forever." See Judith, 16: 17. Eccles. 7: 17. Comp. 2 Esdras, 2: 34. and 6: 9, 25. Suffer me now to ask, where could the writers of the Apocrypha learn the doctrine of "the day of judgment" but from the creed

of Zoroaster, for this is both the sentiment and the very phraseology which he uses as has been seen above from Prideaux. It cannot be questioned, that the phrase "the day of judgment" does not once occur in the Old Testament in this sense. If it is denied that they learned this sentiment and language from the creed of Zoroaster, let the denier show from what Divine source they could learn it? As Christians could not learn either this sentiment or the language in which it is expressed from the Old Testament, we ask how came they by such sentiments and language, unless they derived it from Zoroaster's creed or at second hand from the Apocrypha. It will not answer to say, Jesus Christ and his apostles used the phrase "the day of judgment," and Christians have borrowed the language and sentiment from them. No, this will never do, for first, we have shown in our answer to Mr. Sabine, that in no text where this language is used is such a sentiment conveyed by it. But second, if we were even to grant this, what would follow from it. It would follow, that Jesus Christ and his apostles adopted the sentiments and language of the Apocryphal writers, or to speak all the truth, that both were indebted to the great impostor Zoroaster, for inventing both the sentiment and language for them some hundred years before. Yea, that all of them, were indebted to the ancient creed of the Magians for this doctrine and the language in which it is expressed, for both are found there. Let our brethren then, who contend for this doctrine consider its origin; for to build their faith on the New Testament as its source, is worse than the Old; for it makes the writers not revealers of a new doctrine, nor teaching one before revealed in the Old Testament, but adopting a sentiment and language, which originated in the Magian creed, was transmitted by the great impostor Zoroaster, and

the Apocryphal writers to Jesus Christ and his apostles, and from them to all Christians ever since.

6th. What are the opinions taught by the Apocryphal writers, respecting the *duration of future punishment*? Their opinion about this was, that it should never end. Thus in Judith, 16, 17. where, speaking of the wicked it is said—"The Lord Almighty will take vengeance of them in the day of judgment, in putting fire and worms in their flesh; and they shall feel them and weep forever." Bad as the ancient Magian religion was, it does not appear to have taught the endless duration of punishment. And, if Jahn is to be believed, as quoted above, Zoroaster's disciples taught that the wicked were to be purified by fire at the day of judgment, and made happy with the good. It is certain the ancient Greeks believed in endless punishment, and from this source, or the creed of Zoroaster, the Apocryphal writers I think must have derived it. They could not learn such a doctrine from the Old Testament scriptures, for it is not taught there. Many contend that it is taught in the New Testament. Allowing it is, I ask how the writers of the Apocrypha came to believe it and teach it long before the New Testament was written? Did the New Testament writers adopt a doctrine, taught by Apocryphal writers, which they derived from the heathen? This to be sure would be doing great honor to them, but what comes of the honor, or credit of Christ and his apostles if this was admitted?

Such are the religious opinions found in the Apocrypha, all closely connected with our present inquiry. We would candidly ask our orthodox brethren, how those writers came to speak so clearly and explicitly on these topics, long before the New Testament was written? As their information could not be derived from the Old Testament, where did they .

obtain it? Did Daniel reveal it to the Jews while they were in Babylon? If he did, why was it mixed up with such fables as are found in the Apocrypha, and transmitted to posterity by Apocryphal writers? And, if such opinions be true, why did the New Testament writers not avail themselves of such explicit information, and teach them to the world? No man, we think, will affirm that such opinions are taught so clearly and explicitly in the New Testament as they are in the Apocrypha. And Christians cannot well deny, that the sentiments and even the language of their creeds, bear a greater resemblance to what is found in the Apocrypha, than any thing taught either in the Old or New Testament. Many doubt the truth of such articles. But could any man have disputed their truth, had the Apocrypha been a part of divine revelation? To make sure of such articles being found in Scripture, we propose that further search be made for proof that the Apocryphal books are truly divine, and that they be bound up as formerly with the allowed canonical books. This will save such articles from oblivion, and in all coming time no Christian can be at a loss to prove them from the Bible.

7th. What were the religious opinions among the Jews not found in Scripture, during the days of Christ and his apostles? The New Testament itself affords evidence, that opinions prevailed not found in their Scriptures. For example, our Lord told the Jews in general terms, that they had made God's law void, through their traditions. See some of these opinions noticed in the quotations from L'Enfant, Jahn and others, above. Other opinions we shall have occasion to notice in succeeding Sections. See also Whitby on Rom. 2. referred to above. The opinions of Josephus concerning a state of future rewards and punishments are well known, and need not be quoted.

Those who wish to see a pretty full account of the opinions of the Sadducees, Pharisees, and other sects among the Jews, may consult Prideaux, vol. iii. p. 353—389. See also Jahn's Arch. p. 402—404. 411. which my limits forbid quoting. Nor is it necessary for it would only be to repeat opinions already noticed.

8th. The history of the Christian church shows, that many heathen opinions were incorporated with Christianity, and increased from bad to worse, until what was called Christianity, became worse than heathenism itself. The first converts were Jews, and vast multitudes of converts were also made from among the Gentiles.—Such continued to retain many of their former false opinions. When Christianity became the religion of the Roman empire, men, formerly heathen priests and philosophers, became teachers in the Christian church, so that it soon became popular but greatly corrupted. Those who wish to see this gradual corruption traced and exposed, may consult Dr. Campbell's Ecclesiastical history, Mosheim's church history, Milner's, and others. The fact is notorious, and universally admitted, and my limits forbid a more particular statement. We shall conclude this Section by noticing the following facts.

1st. The whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, which has so long been the Diana of the religious world was the invention of Zoroaster. Prideaux, vol. i. p. 230. thus writes. "And whether it were, that these Magians thought it would bring the greater credit to them, or the kings, that it would add a greater sacredness to their persons, or whether it were from both these causes, the royal family among the Persians, as long as this sect prevailed among them, was always reckoned of the sacerdotal tribe. They were divided into three orders. The lowest were the inferior clergy, who served in all the common offices of their di-

worship: next above them were the superintend-
 who in their several districts governed the infe-
 lergy, as the bishops do with us; and above all
 the Archimagus, or arch-priest, who, in the same
 manner as the high priest among the Jews, or the
 now among the Romanists, was the head of the
 religion. And, according to the number of
 orders, the churches or temples in which they
 resided were also of three sorts. The lowest sort
 the parochial churches, or oratories, which were
 governed by the inferior clergy, as the parochial church-
 es now with us; and the duties which they there
 performed were to read the daily offices out of their
 books, and, at stated and solemn times, to read some
 of their sacred writings to the people. In these
 churches there were no fire altars; but the sacred
 fire before which they here worshipped, was main-
 tained only in a lamp. Next above these were their
 temples, in which fire was continually kept burn-
 ing on a sacred altar. And these were, in the same
 manner as cathedrals with us, the churches or tem-
 ples where the superintendents resided. In every one
 of these were also several of the inferior clergy enter-
 tained, who, in the same manner as the choral vicars
 with us, performed all the divine offices under the
 superintendent, and also took care of the sacred fire,
 so that they constantly watched day and night by four
 or six in their turns, that it might always be kept
 burning, and never go out. The highest church above
 all the fire temple, where the Archimagus resid-
 ed, which was had in the same veneration with them
 as the temple of Mecca among the Mahometans, to
 which every one of that sect thought themselves oblig-
 ed to make a pilgrimage once in their lives. Zoroas-
 ter first settled it at Balch, and there he, as their Ar-
 chimagus, usually had his residence. But after the
 Mahometans had overrun Persia, in the 7th century

after Christ, the Archimagus was forced to remove from thence into Kerman, which is a province in Persia, lying upon the Southern ocean, towards India, and there it hath continued even to this day. And to the fire temple there erected, at the place of his residency, do they now pay the same veneration as formerly they did to that of Balch. This temple of the Archimagus, as also the other fire temples, were endowed with large revenues in lands: but the parochial clergy depended solely on the tithes and offerings of the people; for this usage also had Zoroaster taken from the Jewish church, and made it one of the establishments among his Magians."

Let it be remembered, that Dean Prideaux was a prophet of their own, which forbids the slightest surmise that this account is either misrepresented or exaggerated. But, while eating the fat, and clothing himself with the wool, arising from such an establishment, he frankly confesses that it was invented by Zoroaster, concerning whom he says, p. 220—"He was the greatest impostor, except Mahomet, that ever appeared in the world, and had all the craft and enterprising boldness of that Arab." A very good origin indeed for—"Mystery Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." It was surely proper, that the greatest imposition ever palmed on the world, should be the invention of one of the greatest impostors the world ever produced. As it was invented at Babylon, published at Babylon, and imported from Babylon, it is very properly called—"Mystery Babylon the great." After such a disclosure by one of the craftsmen, that man must be dead drunk with the wine of her fornications, who still continues to cry—"great is Diana of the Ephesians."

2d. Another fact is, that all sects and parties in religion, are silent about the religion of Zoroaster.

The Ecclesiastical hierarchy has met with both assault and insult from almost every sect. But in the course of our reading we have never met with any one of them who ventured to expose it as an invention of Zoroaster. Many a prayer has been made for the downfal of Mahomet and the destruction of Paganism : but who ever heard a prayer made for the destruction of Magianism or the religion of Zoroaster? But why not? Is it not because the creeds of the different sects and that of Zoroaster are very similar? From his Lord God the Pope, down to the lowest dissenter, all firmly hold some articles invented by Zoroaster. It would not do for any of the sects to insult the clergy, by telling them that Zoroaster was the inventor of their ecclesiastical establishment. No, they could retort upon them, for if this was any argument against it, they must admit it was of equal force against such articles of their own creeds, as Zoroaster was the inventor of both. If they attacked the hierarchy with such a weapon as this they wounded themselves, and if the building fell by such an assault their own creeds must be demolished with it. The base born origin of the Mother of Harlots, must be concealed, for every grade of relationship, however distant, must share in the disgrace. Dean Prideaux loved the inventions of Zoroaster but called him the greatest impostor that ever arose, Mahomet excepted. But instead of this kind of abuse, the religious world ought to erect a monument to his memory, for to him, more than to Jesus Christ, have they been indebted for much that has been counted great, glorious, and good in religion.

3d. It has been noticed by many as a remarkable fact, that before the captivity the Jews were prone to idolatry, but after their return and ever since, have held it in great abhorrence. Is not this great change in the Jews, partly at least, accounted for by their

imbibing Zoroaster's opinions, which were opposed to the worship of idols? But this I merely suggest for consideration, and leave the reader to his own reflections, on the topics which have been discussed in the present Section.

SECTION V.

ALL THE PASSAGES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHERE THE TERM SATAN OCCURS, CONSIDERED.

THE term *Satan*, among Christians, is as much a proper name for a fallen angel, as Peter and Paul are for two of Christ's apostles. In correction of this mistake, Dr. Campbell says, Dissert. 6. "*Satan*, though conceived by us as a proper name, was an appellative in the language spoken by our Lord; for, from the Hebrew it passed into the Syriac, and signified no more than adversary or opponent. It is naturally just as applicable to human as to spiritual agents, and is, in the Old Testament, often so applied." The truth of this statement we have seen, Sect. 3.

It has been allèged that the New Testament speaks more frequently and explicitly about the devil and satan than the Old. Let us see how this matter stands. The term *satan* occurs thirty-four times in the Old Testament, and is fifteen times rendered adversary, or by some similar word. But though it occurs thirty-five times in the New Testament, it is not once rendered by any word. It is easily perceived then, that this circumstance gives to the New Testament the appearance of teaching the existence of such a being which the Old has not. But every

an must see, that it is a very false appearance. his false appearance is very much increased, from the very frequent occurrence of the term devil, and the plural devils, to which like the term satan, people have attached the idea of a fallen angel. But it is well known that the words *daimon* and *daimonion*, have no reference to that being Christians call *the devil*, but to demons or dead men deified. The reader is requested to consult Farmer, Jahn, and Dr. Campbell on this subject. It is only with the word *diabolos*, rendered devil, we are concerned in this Inquiry, which occurs in the New Testament thirty-six times. excluding all the other places where the words devil and devils are the rendering of *daimon* and *daimonion*, I must see what an alteration it makes on the face of the New Testament. Even in our English version the term *diabolos* is sometimes rendered *slanderer* and *the accuser*, as the word signifies. Dr. Campbell, where Judas is called a devil, renders it *spy*, and *diabolos* is rendered in a similar manner by other translators. Supposing then, that the words *shaitan* and *diabolos*, had been rendered *adversary* and *slanderer*, or by similar words, it would have been difficult to find a fallen angel under those names in the Bible. In the Old Testament the term *satan* signifies an *adversary*, and is applied to the angel of Jehovah, the evil passions of men, a piece of writing, the evil principle deified, &c. The terms *satan* and *devil* are used in a similar way in the New Testament, which we shall now proceed to show.

Matth. 16: 23. "But he turned and said unto Peter, get thee behind me satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." See also the parallel text in Mark 8: 33. which I need not transcribe. Here our Lord does not say that Peter was possessed of satan, that he acted like him, or that he was in-

fluenced by him, but positively calls one of his own disciples *satan*. But was Peter a fallen angel or wicked spirit? The expression "*get thee behind me satan*," is the same that our Lord used, Luke 4 : 8. when he was tempted of the devil and *satan*. There is nothing at all remarkable in calling Peter *satan*, as David and the angel of the Lord were called so in the Old Testament. "Get thee behind me adversary," was highly proper language, for Peter was our Lord's adversary, not from design, but from ignorance and mistaken views, as is evident from the context, and also from the reason assigned; "For thou savourest not the things which be of God, but those which be of men." The Old and New Testament writers therefore perfectly harmonise in the sense attached to this word.

Luke 22 : 31, 32. "And the Lord said Simon, Simon, behold, *satan* hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat : but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not : and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." Peter in the last text, was a *satan* or adversary, and now our Lord told him *satan* desired to sift him as wheat. But where in the history of Peter do we find that an evil being ever attempted to injure him? But if we consult verses 32—35. and verses 54—63. of this chapter, we see that Peter was three times put through the sieve and sifted like wheat, by being three times charged with being one of our Lord's disciples, and he as often denying him. Peter's faith seemed to fail him for a season, but our Lord prayed for him that it might not entirely fail. In Psalm 109. and other places noticed in Sect. 3. we have seen that the unbelieving Jews are called a *satan* or adversary to our Lord. Here they showed themselves so by sifting Peter as wheat, for their opposition was chiefly against the Saviour. To assert that a fallen angel influenced the Jews,

has no evidence to support it from text or context. Indeed, only render the term *satan* adversary, and no one would think of a fallen angel as concerned in this affair. Our Lord only says, "behold the adversary hath desired you that he may sift you as wheat."

Mark 3: 23. "And he called them unto him, and said unto them in parables, how can *satan* cast out *satan*." See the whole context. The following remarks from Jahn are sufficient on this passage. He says, p. 226—"Jesus, in Matt. 12: 24—30. Mark 3: 22—30. Luke 11: 16—24. employs against the Pharisees the ARGUMENTUM AD HOMINEM, which has no bearing in this case any further than the refutation of the adversary is concerned. The ground of his employing this species of argument in the present instance was this. The Pharisees, if we may believe Josephus, taught, that the demons, by which men were possessed, were the spirits of bad men, who were dead, and were commissioned on their present business of tormenting the children of men by Beelzebub. Jesus, therefore, replied, provided this were the true state of the case, that Beelzebub, by lending his assistance in casting out his own devils, was overturning his own kingdom. He then adds, that this powerful spirit, for such the Pharisees supposed him to be, could not be compelled to perform such an unwelcome task, unless a stronger one than Beelzebub himself, should first come, should bind him, and take away his arms."

Luke 10: 18. "And he said unto them, I beheld *satan* as lightning fall from heaven." The following remarks from Jahn are also sufficient on this text. He says, p. 225—"Jesus, in Luke 10: 17. does not assert the operations of demons in men, for he couples Satan with serpents and scorpions, which places us under the necessity of interpreting *all* these words tropically, and of understanding by them cunning and

powerful adversaries, who opposed the progress of the Gospel, but with all their power were unable to interrupt its advancement. The expressions which he employs are as follows. 'I see, (Hebrew *אני רואה*) I see Satan,' i.e. all the adversaries of the Gospel, who are afterwards called serpents, scorpions, and the enemy's host, 'fall like lightning from heaven,' i.e. from the political heaven, from power and authority. Consult Isai. 14: 12, 13. Matthew 24th chapter, Luke 10: 15. Revelation 12: 7—9. see also Cicero, where he says to Mark Antony, *you have hurled your colleagues down from heaven.* (The adversaries of the Gospel occur in Luke 22: 31. under the name of *Satan*.) 'Behold, (he proceeds,) I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy,' i.e. of overcoming and subduing by your miraculous gifts all adversaries, 'and nothing shall by any means hurt you,' i.e. oppress and overcome you, (comp. *adversari* with the Hebrew *פָּרַשׁ*.) 'Notwithstanding, in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you, but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven,' i.e. rejoice rather in the favor of God, than in the power of casting out devils, or of healing the most difficult diseases." In addition to these remarks I would ask, how many fallings from heaven has satan had, for he fell from heaven before he tempted Eve, and fell again it seems while the seventy disciples were on their tour of preaching? But how did he get to heaven to make a second fall from it, and while there, was he also walking about on our earth seeking whom he might devour?

Luke 13: 16. "And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?" Jahn on this passage says, p. 227—
"Jesus liberates the woman, described in Luke 13:

12. as bowed down with infirmity, without making any mention of a demon; if, therefore, a little after, he asserts, that she was a daughter of Abraham, bound by Satan for eighteen years, the expressions are to be considered as figurative, being an allusion to the loosing of oxen, which it was lawful to do on the Sabbath in order to lead them to drink, and having reference at the same time to an opinion among the Jews, that all diseases had their ultimate origin, (not indeed from *demons*,) but from the Devil, that overruling spirit of wickedness, who tempted Eve, and to whom allusions are made in Acts 10 : 38. and in 2 Cor. 12 : 7." Dr. Lightfoot on Matth. 17. says—"that the Jews usually attributed some of the more grievous diseases to evil spirits, especially those in which either the body was distorted or the mind disturbed." Jahn and Dr. Lightfoot allow that such opinions existed among the Jews, and we have shown Sect. 4. how they came to imbibe them. But no countenance is given to the truth of the opinion, that a fallen angel was the cause of this woman's disorder. It is called "*a spirit of infirmity*." Dr. Campbell says, Dissert. 6.—"It is a common idiom among the Jews, to put *spirit* before any quality ascribed to a person, whether it be good or bad, mental or corporeal. Thus the spirit of fear, the spirit of meekness, the spirit of slumber, the spirit of jealousy, are used to express habitual fear, &c." *A spirit of infirmity* then, was an habitual infirmity, which was certainly true of this woman, for she could in no wise lift up herself "for eighteen years." This complaint medical men have called "*the rigidity of the back bone*." Notice, when our Lord restored her, he does not command *satan* to leave this woman, nor does he rebuke him, but says—"woman, thou art loosed." Loosed from *satan*? No, thou art loosed from thine *infirmity*. This bound her, and was sufficient without his assistance.

Notice further, that our Lord in the act of healing her “laid his hands on her, and immediately she was made straight and glorified God.” The ruler of the synagogue, speaking according to the true state of the case, spoke of this woman as laboring under a mere bodily disorder. He does not say—there are six days, in them come and be *loosed from satan’s bondage*, but in them come and be *healed*, verse 14. He was filled with indignation because our Lord had *healed* her on the Sabbath. What was said by our Lord about satan, in defence of his conduct, is predicated on two grounds; 1st. On the principles of common humanity, which the Jews exercised towards their cattle on the Sabbath. “Thou hypocrite” says Jesus, “doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering?” What was the inference from this? Ought not this woman a daughter of Abraham to be loosed from her infirmity on the Sabbath? 2d. He defends his conduct on the supposition that satan had bound this woman. If they believed this, how could they blame him for loosing her on the Sabbath day. Who could resist these reasons? Accordingly it is said verse 17. that “all his adversaries were ashamed: and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him.” Here our Lord showed his wisdom in refuting his adversaries. But let us suppose, that satan positively was the cause of this woman’s disorder, what follows? It follows, that our Lord, neither on this or any other occasion, warned men against his great power and malignity, nor were the people half so much alarmed, as they would have been, if a wild beast had visited their neighborhood. They showed no fear respecting such a powerful wicked being. Whoever contends that satan bound this woman, ought to contend, that all persons so bound now, and why not all dis-

eases, are inflicted by him. If this be true, we are in a miserable condition. Medical men may scatter all their knowledge of the healing art to the winds, and henceforth learn to work miracles, or cultivate the friendship of satan, as the only means left them of excelling in their profession.

Luke 22: 3. "Then entered satan into Judas, surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve." If satan entered into Judas, was not Judas possessed of satan? But it is a fact, that though persons are said to have been possessed of demons, yet we never read of one who was possessed of the devil or satan. But how could satan be in Judas, tormenting the wicked in hell, and tempting all the world besides, unless we make him almost equal to God himself? And if he did enter Judas for the purpose of working evil, is it not strange that some good angel did not also enter him to counter-work his evil devices? Well, what satan entered into Judas? I answer, *the spirit of opposition to Jesus and the secret purpose to betray him.* The 4th verse shows this, for—"he went his way and communed with the chief priests and captains how he might betray him unto them." See on the next passage.

John 13: 27. "And after the sop satan entered into him." What satan now entered Judas, for it was said in the preceding passage, that satan had entered into him? I answer, his *fixed determination immediately to execute his purpose.* It was just before the last Passover, Judas purposed to betray Jesus, and bargained with the chief priests about it, Matth. 26: 14—17. This purpose is called satan entering into him, Luke 22: 1—7. and the devil putting it into his heart, John 13: 2. But, from the time he formed the purpose, until he received the sop, none but himself, Jesus, and the chief priests knew his design. At verse 10. Jesus says, "ye are clean but not all."

comp. verse 11. Again at verse 18. he says—"but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, he that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me." But at verse 21. Jesus says plainly, "one of you shall betray me." This roused among the disciples the inquiry, "Lord who is it?" To point the person out, without naming him, Jesus says—"he it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop he gave it to Judas." The words before us immediately follow—"and after the sop satan entered into him." What connexion could there be betwixt his receiving the sop and a fallen angel entering into him? But there is a rational connexion, between receiving the sop, and his fixed determination to execute his purpose immediately. The delicate hints of his guilt must have agitated Judas' mind: but giving him the sop, must have roused him to fury, as he was now openly exposed, and he departs to execute his design. The words which follow confirm this—"that thou doest do quickly." These words, though not understood by the rest of the disciples, appear to have been well understood by Judas. They hastened his departure; for upon hearing them he went "immediately out." But where did he go to, and for what purpose? To his employers, the chief priests, that he might execute his determination. See Matth. 26: 47—50. What is a remarkable fact, and confirms the above view, satan is never said to have entered into the Jews. And why not? Because satan had always been in them. They never had been any thing else, but a satan or adversary to our Lord. But Judas had been one of Christ's professed friends, and the same opposition or satan which had always been in the Jews, entered into him when he formed the design to betray Jesus, and also when he determined to execute his design. To this day, when a man acts a very wicked part,

contrary to his former professions, we in popular language say, "satan has entered into him." Besides, the view we have given is in agreement with the Old Testament usage of the term *satan*, where it is applied to the evil principles and bad passions in men.

Acts 5: 3. "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath *satan* filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost and to keep back part of the price of the land?" It is not said that *satan* entered into Ananias, but only that he had *filled his heart*. But what is meant by the words—"why hath *satan* filled thine heart," is in verse 4. thus explained—"why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart." Here two things are obvious. First, what in the one sentence is said to be done by *satan*, is in the other ascribed to *Ananias* himself; and second, what is meant by *satan* *filling* the heart, is explained to mean, Ananias *conceiving this thing in his heart*. It seems to be an Hebrew idiom, and is illustrated by the words of Ahasuerus to Esther the queen. "Who is he? And where is he that durst presume in his heart to do so?" It is in the margin—"whose heart hath filled him." See Esth. 7: 5. Notice further, that it is not said *satan* had filled the heart of Sapphira, verse 9. Peter only says to her—"how is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the spirit of the Lord?" But why? for she lied as well as her husband. This is accounted for by considering, that great or uncommon instances of natural or moral evil among the Jews were ascribed to *satan*. Yea, we have seen, Sect. 4. that *satan* was considered the author and director of all evil. Peter speaks at the outset, of the greatness of the sin of lying to the Holy Spirit; in the popular language of the times—"why hath *satan* filled thine heart." But he had also explained his meaning, or spoken according to the true state of the case, by saying "why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart." After this it would have

been incongruous to introduce again the popular language about satan in speaking to Sapphira. What shows Satan, a fallen angel, had nothing to do with the sin of either of them is, Peter's explanation of the popular language—"why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart," agrees precisely with James' account how people are tempted to sin. "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed," chap. 1: 13, 14. James does not allow any man to say when he is tempted, that he is tempted of God, for God tempteth no man. But if it be true, that Ananias was, or any man is tempted of satan, would he not allow them to say the truth? But James expressly declares that every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own *lust*. Ananias and his wife were drawn away by their lust or love of money. This satan filled their heart. They were enticed by it to lie to the Spirit of God. But had a fallen angel enticed them or others, why is he never blamed for it by those whom he seduced? Did David blame him? Did even Judas blame him? No, bad as he was, he takes all the blame to himself. "I have betrayed the innocent blood." Nor is satan ever threatened with any punishment. Ananias and his wife are struck dead for their crime, but if satan was the chief agent why does he escape? For a very good reason, there never was such a being to be punished.

Acts 26: 18. "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among those who are sanctified by faith which is in me." The history of Paul's preaching does not afford an instance that he ever purposed, or actually did turn a single individual from

the power of a fallen angel, called the devil or satan. Had such a remarkable thing happened, we think it would have been noticed, and the person congratulated on account of his deliverance. He turned many from the power of *the adversary*, for it is said he turned away much people, saying they were no Gods which were made with hands. Was there no adversary but a fallen angel from which he could turn men? The persecuting Jews are called satan. Peter was called satan. And surely the whole system of ignorance and superstition, upheld by priests and civil rulers, were a satan or adversary. See this more fully shown on Eph. 6: 11. in the next Section. From this satan many were turned, as the history of the Acts of the Apostles shows. Comp. Col. 1: 13. where we read of men turned from "*the power of darkness.*" Accordingly some read the passage before us thus: "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, *even* from the power of satan unto God." The darkness of ignorance, superstition, and wickedness, were the satan from which Paul turned men, and this he did by the light of the glorious gospel of Christ.

Rom. 16: 20. "And the God of peace shall bruise satan under your feet shortly." It is not easily conceived how a fallen angel was bruised under the feet of Christians in the apostolic age. It does not accord with fact, and satan is now believed to be as subtle, powerful, and active as ever. The term satan is frequently used to designate the persecuting Jews, and this declaration of the apostle is agreeable to the fact, for they were bruised under the feet of Christians in the destruction of their city and temple, and dispersion among all nations as our Lord predicted, Matth. 24. At this period the disciples of Jesus had rest from their persecutions. The God of

peace bruised the adversary under the feet of Christians.

1 Cor. 5 : 5. "To deliver such an one unto satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." I shall here avail myself of some remarks I made on this passage in the Universalist Magazine, vol. vii. No. 33. "I need not stop to prove, that the term *spirit*, is often used in Scripture as equivalent to *person*, or for the person himself. Paul certainly did not mean this person's *spirit* separate from his body, for it does not appear, that his punishment included such a separation: nor that it was to be punished to the end of the world and then saved, for he says nothing about the destruction or punishment of his spirit. Besides, is it not the common belief, that unless persons' spirits are saved before death, they never can be saved after it? If satan was a fallen angel to whom this person was delivered, it is rather strange, that such a being should be in any way the instrument of such a salvation. Besides, if the day of the Lord here means the end of this world, and *spirit* a part of man which exists separate from the body, why is the salvation of his spirit only mentioned? One should rather think, that it would be the flesh that required salvation from the hands of satan, for he was to destroy the flesh that the spirit might be saved. Was this person's flesh or body not to be saved? But the question is, what is the meaning of this passage? This I shall state briefly, without entering into the detail of the evidence whereby my views may be supported.—It is well known, that the term *satan* signifies an adversary. It is often applied to the adversaries of Christians and Christianity. This person in the church at Corinth was guilty of incest. See verse 1. The apostle commanded them to deliver him over to this satan, or to put him away from among

themselves, verse 13. This was to be done for the person's good, the destruction or punishment of the flesh, or to bring him to repentance, and that he might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. The first question that arises here is, what day of the Lord Jesus is meant? I answer, that day which our Lord had forewarned his disciples of, and in view of which he exhorted them to be found watchful and faithful. See Matth. 24. Well, what kind of salvation did the apostle mean, when he said, 'that the spirit or person may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus?' I answer the same kind of salvation enjoyed by all those who endured to the end. Matth. 24: 13. This person was not believing to the salvation of his soul or person, but was drawing back to perdition. He was not looking for his Lord's coming, but was saying by his conduct, my Lord delayeth his coming. Such were the means prescribed for converting this sinner from the error of his way, and saving a soul or person from death, and hiding a multitude of sins. The means proved effectual, as is evident from 2 Cor. 2. where Paul commands the Corinthians to forgive him, and to confirm their love to him; and assigns as a reason why they should do so, 'lest satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices.' What satan, pray? The very same satan or the adversaries of the gospel, to whom this person was delivered for the destruction of the flesh."

1 Tim. 1: 20. "Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." The remarks on the last text are sufficient here.

1 Cor. 7: 5. "Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that satan tempt you not for your incontinen-

cy." At Corinth, prostitution formed a part of the worship of the gods. To avoid fornication among Christians, the apostle commands that every man should have his own wife, and every woman her own husband, verse 2. But if the one defrauded the other, the defrauded, in such a place as Corinth, was liable to be tempted by satan, or the adversaries of the gospel, to licentiousness. To guard them against bringing such a reproach on Christ's name, this injunction was delivered. Comp. verse 4. where their mutual rights are stated. But somewhat of a different view may be given of this passage in agreement with the Scripture usage of the term satan. It sometimes designates lust or sinful desire, which might, if the one defrauded the other, prove a satan or adversary to tempt them to licentious indulgence.

2 Cor. 2: 11. "Lest satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices." See on 1 Cor. 5: 5. above, for the meaning of this text. I may just add, that the Scripture usage of the term satan, would warrant us to say, that an unforgiving temper of mind was the satan here referred to. It is surely *an adversary* to a Christian, and gets an advantage over him if he indulges it.

2 Cor. 11: 14. "And no marvel; for satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." The whole context goes to show that the apostle is speaking of human beings. He speaks 1st. Of satan, which simply means an adversary; and we think it indisputable that this term is applied both in the Old and New Testaments to the unbelieving and persecuting Jews. They were transformed into an angel of light, for their opposition was under the pretence of great zeal for God and the law. It is implied, that in reality they were the angel of darkness, considered by Zoroaster the author and director of all evil. This was indeed the case with the Jews, for they were the

authors and directors of all the opposition to Christians and Christianity, as the whole New Testament shows. 2d. The apostle also speaks of the "*ministers*" of this satan. No one we think can dispute, that the apostle calls the false teachers in the church at Corinth the ministers of satan. They were transformed as ministers of righteousness, for under pretence of preaching the gospel they perverted it. See verses 3, 4, 12, 13, 15. They preached another gospel, see Gal. 1: 6—10. Compare Acts 15: 1. &c. Gal. 5: 1—7. and many other passages. They were in heart opposed to the Gospel, and were in fact joined with the unbelieving Jews, in opposing the truth and the apostles who preached it. They were the ministers or assistants of the Jews, who were the open and avowed adversaries of Christianity. If satan was transformed into an angel of light, there was no cause to marvel, that his ministers should transform themselves into the apostles of Christ, and as ministers of righteousness. The apostle says concerning them, "whose end shall be according to their works." What end? The apostle tells us that their end "is destruction," Phil. 3: 18, 19. The same destruction which came on the unbelieving Jews whose ministers they were, see Phil. 1: 28, 29. 1 Peter 4: 17, 18. See particularly on Matth. 24, 25. and 2 Thess. 2. in the Second Part.

2 Cor. 12: 7, "And lest I should be exalted above measure, through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of satan, to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure." The word which is here translated messenger is *angelos*, and which in other places is rendered angel. It was then "the angel of satan" that buffeted Paul. Well, let us hear Dr. Kennicott. He says, Dissert. i. p. 100.—"For the *messenger of satan* means here a false teacher, in opposition to a

true apostle called '*the messenger of God*,' Gal. 4 : 14." See Parkhurst on the word *Angelos* : and on the last passage for the *satan* here meant.

1 Thess. 2 : 18. "Wherefore we would have come unto you (even I Paul) once and again ; but *satan* hindered us." Acts 17. 1 Thess. 3 : 1—9. with many other passages show, that the *satan* who hindered Paul from going to the Thessalonians, were the persecuting Jews, whom we have seen are frequently called *satan*. Nothing in Paul's history shows that a fallen angel ever troubled him. Only render the term *satan*, adversary here, and in other places, and such a being disappears.

2 Thess. 2 : 9. "Even him, whose coming is after the working of *satan*, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders." The apostle simply says here, "whose coming is after the working of the adversary," as we have seen that the term *satan* signifies. If this is understood of the persecuting Jews, who are called *satan* in other texts, it is agreeable to the fact, for many came in Christ's name before the destruction of Jerusalem, pretending to work miracles, so that if it had been possible they would have deceived the very elect. See Matth. 24. and Whitby on 2 Thess. chap. 2.

1 Tim. 5 : 15. "For some are already turned aside after *satan*." What *satan* had they turned aside after ? The words which immediately precede show this : "I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the *adversary* to speak reproachfully." The *satan*, after whom they had turned aside, was evidently the *adversary* who spoke reproachfully. It is beyond all doubt the Jews are referred to, for they are called both *satan* and *adversary* in other texts, and they did speak reproachfully of Christians. It is not easily perceived, how persons could turn aside after

en angel, but to apostatise from the faith, or go to its adversaries, is easily understood.

ev. 2: 9. "I know thy works, and tribulation, and martyrdom (but thou art rich) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of satan." Who a true Jew was, Paul tells us, Rom. 2: 28, 29. The persons spoken of, *they were Jews, but were not.* They were of the synagogue of satan, or adversary: or they belonged to the synagogue of the unbelieving persecuting Jews.

Never supposed that a fallen angel had a synagogue, and, that the persons John speaks of belonged to it? Nor can it be believed that any number of them had a synagogue in those days, and that it was called "the synagogue of satan," or of a fallen angel. But the synagogue of the adversary occasions no difficulty.

ev. 3: 9. "Behold I will make them of the synagogue of satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie; behold I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved them." See on the last passage a sufficient illustration of this text. I would only add, that it has been thought strange, there is an allusion here to the subjection of the Jews to the Christians in the flourishing state of Christianity.

ev. 2: 13. "I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where satan's seat is: and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you, where satan dwelleth." If satan here means a fallen angel, it must be admitted that his seat was at Pergamus in the days of John. If satan is only rendered adversary, all difficulty is once removed. Pergamus was a noted place of opposition to Christianity, for here Antipas suffered death, and Christ's disciples are highly com-

mended for holding fast his name in such a place of persecution. It will not be easy to show how a wicked spirit had his seat or throne at Pergamus, and at the same time was walking about seeking whom he might devour.

Rev. 2: 24. "But unto you I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira, (as many as have not this doctrine, and who have not known the depths of satan, as they speak) I will put upon you none other burden." Here again it is only necessary to translate the word satan adversary, and all idea of a fallen angel disappears. The deep things, or depths of satan, are the depths of the adversary. It is said that the Gnostics called their mysteries the deep things of God and the deep things of Bythus. And Lowman calls it the deep arts of deceit and error. Paul says, we are not ignorant of his devices, 2 Cor. 2: 11. And the whole conduct of the persecuting Jews is a comment on this passage and others above considered.

Such are all the places in the New Testament where the word satan occurs, and it is evident, that the Old and New Testament usage of it are very similar, or rather the same. In neither does it designate a fallen angel, whom Christians call the devil and satan.

SECTION VI.

ALL THE PASSAGES WHERE THE ORIGINAL TERM *DIABOLOS*,
TRANSLATED DEVIL, IS USED, CONSIDERED.

WE have seen that the term satan means *an adversary*, and have noticed its various applications by the

sacred writers. We are now to pay some attention to the *meaning* and *application* of the term (*diabolos*) devil, and shall introduce the various texts where it occurs in the New Testament, by taking some notice of the word *devil*, as used in our English version of the Old.

Let it be then observed, that the term *devils* is used in the following places in the Old Testament. "And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto *devils*, after whom they have gone a whoring. They sacrificed unto *devils*, not to God; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not. And Jeroboam ordained him priests for the high places, and for the devils, and for the calves which he had made. Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils." Lev. 17: 7. Deut. 32: 17. 2 Chron. 11: 15. Psalm 106: 37. The word rendered devils in this last text is *daimonion* in the Seventy's version, and also in the following places: Psalm 96: 5. and 91: 6. Isai. 65: 10. 34: 14. and 13: 21. It is evident that these devils were only heathen idols, or Pagan deities, which could neither do good nor evil to any man. They were *made*, and some of them were styled *new gods*, or devils which had come newly up, and which were not formerly known or feared by the Jews or their fathers. To these devils or gods, the Jews sacrificed their sons and daughters. But those Pagan idols or devils, were altogether different from what is meant by the devil or satan; for as Dr. Campbell observes—"They could, therefore, no more be said to have worshipped the devil, as we Christians understand the term, than they could be said to have worshipped the cannibals of New Zealand: because they had no more conception of the one than of the other." Dissert. 6. He adds, a little further on—"As to the worship of the devil, *tu diabolous*, nothing

can be clearer than that in Scripture, no Pagans are charged with it." The fact is, the Jews knew nothing about the devil until they went to Babylon. The words *daimon* and *daimonion* in the New Testament, are also rendered by the term devil, and in the plural devils; and we find them spoken of as numerous. One man was possessed with a legion of them. These were *demons* not *devils*, as Christians commonly understand the term. Concerning this distinction Dr. Campbell says—"What the precise idea of the *demons*, to whom possessions were ascribed, then was, it would perhaps be impossible for us with any certainty to affirm; but as it is evident that the two words *diabolos* and *daimonion*, are not once confounded, though the first occurs in the New Testament upwards of thirty times, and the second above sixty, they can, by no just rule of interpretation, be rendered by the same term. Possessions are never attributed to the being termed *o diabolos*." Dissert. 6. Dr. Campbell says, "The word *diabolos*, in its ordinary acceptance, signifies *calumniator, traducer, false accuser*, from the verb *diaballein*, to calumniate." This is also its meaning as given by Parkhurst and other lexicographers, which need not be quoted. Its *extraordinary* acceptance, with them and others is, that it designates a fallen angel, who is the implacable enemy of God and man. But the three first passages which I shall quote, show, that our translators understood the word *diabolos* in the way Dr. Campbell explains it, which he says, is its *ordinary* acceptance. The first is

1 Tim. 3: 11. "Even so must their wives be grave, not *slanderers* (*diabolous*) sober, faithful in all things." Here pious women are exhorted not to be slanderers; literally, "not to be devils." The very same word is used verses 6, 7. in the singular number and is rendered devil. Again, it is said, Titus 2: 3. "the aged women likewise, that they be in be-

behaviour as becometh holiness, not *false accusers*" (*diabolous*.) Here the word again occurs in the plural, and is rendered *false accusers*. Aged, pious women are exhorted not to be devils! Again, 2 Tim. 3: 3. speaking of those who in the last days should have a form of godliness but denying the power of it, they are said to be "without natural affection, truce-breakers, *false accusers*" (*diaboloi*.) Literally, devils. Suffer me now to ask, why in these three texts the word was not rendered devils? The reason is obvious; it would appear very strange to our ears to exhort Christian women not to be devils, for we have associated the idea of a fallen angel with this word as we have with the term *satan*. It would have been just a similar impropriety, had the angel of the Lord, David, and others been called *satan*. But to avoid this impropriety, *satan* is rendered adversary in the Old Testament, and in the above texts, the term *diabolos* is rendered slanderer and false accuser. These three texts however, show us, both how it was understood by the apostle and also by our translators. Let the reader keep these remarks in view, while we consider all the other texts, where the term *diabolos* occurs in the New Testament.

John 6: 70. "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" Dr. Campbell renders the term *diabolos* here *spy*, and Newcome and Wakefield, render it *accuser*. This is in agreement with the preceding texts, and further remark is unnecessary.

John 13: 2. "And supper being ended (the devil having now put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son to betray him.*)" See on Luke 22: 3. and John 13: 27. in the last Section, as a sufficient explanation of this passage. What is said to be done by *satan* in one, is said to be done by the devil in the other, which shows that they are only two names for the same thing. Suffer me here to ask, When one

man betrays another in our day, is the plea sustained in court or any where else, that the devil urged him on to it? And, would any man hang himself, if he believed he was the tool of such a powerful and malicious being? Judas' crime is wholly imputed to himself, Acts 1 : 17, 18. And every man is conscious when he sins, that he did not need the assistance of such a being. The Scriptures, in plain language, refer sin to ourselves and not to the devil. See James 1 : 14. and Mark 7 : 21, 22.

1 Peter 5 : 8, 9. "Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom resist steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world." As this is one of the principal texts quoted in proof of the existence of an evil being, called the devil I shall consider it particularly. We have then, 1st. An exhortation, "be sober, be vigilant." This was addressed to Christians scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, &c. chap. 1 : 1. It is so plain, that they were suffering persecution from the enemies of the gospel, that it would be loss of time to give any proof of it. 2d. We have next the reason assigned why this exhortation should be obeyed. Why be sober and vigilant? "Because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." It is confidently believed by many good people, that this devil who walketh about like a roaring lion, is a fallen angel, or malignant spirit. But I ask, how is such a belief to be reconciled with his having his abode in hell, with some in the air, and others, his tempting men in all parts of the earth at the same time? Such a belief is contrary to all facts and experience. Did ever any person see the devil in the shape of a lion, hear him roar, or is an instance on record in the history of mankind of one

being devoured by him? Such idle, childish stories have been told of the devil, but what man in our day gives the least credit to them. I find human beings are frequently compared to lions—Numb. 23: 24. 24: 8, 9. Jer. 50: 17. 2 Tim. 4: 17. also to roaring lions, Psalm 22: 13. Prov. 19: 12. 20: 2. Jer. 2: 15. Isai. 5: 29. They are also compared to a devouring lion, Psalm 17: 12. 22: 21. Jer. 2: 30. 4: 7. Ezek. 19: 1—6. 22: 25. On examination I also find that God is compared to a lion and a roaring lion, Isai. 31: 4. Hosea 11: 10. 13: 7, 8. Amos 3: 4—8. Such is the result of my examination of the Scripture usage of the word lion. Not one instance can I find where the devil is compared to a lion. If he is so in this passage, it is a solitary instance, which is presumptive evidence that this was not the apostle's meaning. Who then was this roaring lion? Peter answers by saying, "*your adversary* the devil as a roaring lion walketh about seeking whom he may devour." The word here rendered *adversary* is *anti-dikos*. It only occurs in this and the following texts in the New Testament, Matth. 5: 25. Luke 12: 58. 18: 3. Parkhurst says it means "an adversary or opponent in a law-suit," and quotes Herodian in proof of it. The text under consideration, is the only one in which he considers this word to mean a fallen angel or the devil. He desires us to compare Rev. 12: 10. Job 1: 9. 2: 3. and Zach. 3: 1. in proof that *anti-dikos* in this text means such a wicked spirit. It is very plain that he considered adversary and devil to mean the same thing. We have not only compared, but have considered the passages, and our readers may judge from the evidence we have adduced if they teach such a doctrine. In short, to say that the word *devil*, or the word *adversary* here used as its explanation, refers to a fallen angel, is taking for grant-

ed the very question at issue. Who then was this adversary, the devil who went about like a roaring lion? By recurring to the New Testament usage of *antikeimai*, also rendered adversary, we shall see this.

1st. It is rendered adversary and applied to men who were the adversaries of Christ and of Christianity, particularly the persecuting Jews. Thus, when our Lord had refuted the Jews who had found fault with him for healing a person on their Sabbath, it is said—"all his *adversaries* were ashamed," Luke 13: 17. He also said to his disciples—"I will give you a mouth and wisdom which all your *adversaries* shall not be able to gainsay nor resist," Luke 21: 15. Again, Paul says, 1 Cor. 16: 9.—"For a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many *adversaries*." And Philip. 1: 28. he says—"And in nothing terrified by your *adversaries*: which is to them an evident token of perdition." And in 1 Tim. 5: 14. he exhorteth young women to conduct themselves as to give "none occasion to the *adversary* to speak reproachfully." In all these texts the adversaries of the gospel, particularly the Jews are referred to by the term *adversary*.

2d. It is rendered *opposeth* and *contrary*, and applied to the following things. To the man of sin. "Who *opposeth* and exalteth himself above all that is called God," 2 Thess. 2: 4. To the opposition between flesh and spirit. "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh, and these are *contrary* the one to the other," Gal. 5: 17. And in 1 Tim. 1: 10. it is used to express whatever is opposed to the truth. "And if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine." It is then beyond all fair debate, that *antikeimai*, adversary, is not once used in reference to the devil or satan, though most people say he is the greatest adversary of both

God and man. The fact is certain from the above texts, and the whole New Testament is an illustration of it, that the opposing Jews were the adversary of Christians and the chief cause of all their persecutions. They were the adversary, the devil, the slanderer, or false accuser, who went about as a roaring lion seeking whom he might devour. Hence they are in several texts denominated by the term devil and satan. It cannot be questioned, that Peter referred to the persecuting Jews, for they did go about like a roaring lion; see Acts 17. and indeed all the New Testament. It is also evident that the lusts and evil passions of men are termed adversary in several texts. And why are they termed so? I answer, because it is this devil or adversary within men, which makes them devils or adversaries in their conduct. I may add, the term satan we have seen signifies an adversary, and devil and satan are used synonymously in the New Testament, and both terms are used to express opposing persons and opposing things. That person or thing, is a devil, satan, or adversary to another which is opposed to it. The unbelieving, persecuting Jews are in scripture compared to a lion. Thus Paul says, 2 Tim. 4: 16, 17. "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge. Notwithstanding, the Lord stood with me and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known and that all the Gentiles might hear; and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion." It is thought by some, that by the lion, Paul referred to Nero or his prefect Helius Cesarianus, to whom he committed the government in his absence, with power to put to death whom he pleased. The reason given for this application of lion to Nero is, that Marsyas said to Agrippa when Tiberias died—"the lion is dead." Whether Paul ever heard

this saying is uncertain, and if he had, we doubt whether his wisdom and prudence, in his then critical circumstances, would have allowed him to make such an allusion. What leads me to conclude, that Paul, by the lion, referred to his persecutors the Jews, are the following things.

1st. They actually went about like a lion to devour him, and at the time he wrote was in bonds from their persecutions. Nero, nor any other Roman magistrate sought after Paul or troubled him, until stirred up by the Jews. He was even obliged to appeal to Cæsar to be delivered from their hands. 2d. In Psalm 22: 13, 21. where Christ and his enemies are spoken of, the persecuting Jews are expressly compared to a lion and a roaring lion. If Paul compared them to this, he had the example of David for it. To this Psalm probably Paul alluded in the passage before us. 3d. To understand the apostle by the lion, referring to the persecuting Jews, renders its usage uniform in the New Testament, but to understand it of a fallen angel, is at variance with its entire usage throughout the Bible. It is agreeable to the fact, that the Jews went about as a roaring lion, but it is contrary to all facts and experience, that a fallen angel ever did this. But Peter adds, "whom resist steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world." Who ever doubted, that the "afflictions" of Christians in the apostolic age arose from the persecuting Jews? Compare verse 10. and various other parts of the Epistle. But was a fallen angel in various places at the same time afflicting them? Besides, how could they resist steadfast in the faith an invisible spirit? It was with wicked men they had to contend, and from whom they suffered. See 1 Peter 4: 12. 1: 7. The word devil we have seen signifies a slanderer or false accuser. Peter

then says in this passage—"your adversary the slanderer or false accuser goeth about as a roaring lion." That this referred to men, no one we think can doubt who reads chap. 2: 12, 15, 20. 3: 15—17. and 4: 4. of this epistle. Nor will any one dispute, that the words *o' antidikos* '*umon diabolos*' may be rendered thus; "the adversary your false accuser," or, "your adversary the false accuser." The whole epistle, is a comment on this view of the passage, nor would any one have ever thought of a fallen angel, had the word *diabolos* been rendered false accuser as it is in some other places. Common sense, and common Scripture usage of words, lead us to no other interpretation. It should be remembered, that Peter was a Jew, and was familiar with the meaning of the terms *satan* and *devil*. Jesus had called him *satan* and Judas a *devil*; and could there be any impropriety in calling the persecutors of Christians "your adversary the devil?" And on account of their ferocious cruelty comparing them to a roaring lion walking about seeking whom they might devour.

Is it objected to this view of the passage—"the persecutors of Christians in Peter's day were *many*, but here he speaks of them as *one*." This objection has no force, for it is well known, that in Scripture the singular is frequently put for the plural and the reverse. Besides, all know, that when many are spoken of collectively they are considered as one, and especially when they act in unison about any object. The persecutors of Christians were indeed many, but never did many act more in unison about any object than they did in opposing Christians and Christianity. They were one, and unwearied in their exertions to obtain their object. Is it further objected—"Peter speaks emphatically of the devil, as if he was a real being, for he calls him *the devil*." Answer; the word *diabolos* here is without the article,

therefore this objection is of no force. Even if it had been used, the objection would derive little or no force from it, for it was very natural and proper for Peter to speak of the persecutors of Christians in this emphatic manner.

John 8: 44. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar and the father of it." As this is perhaps the strongest text in proof that the *devil* is a fallen angel, we shall give it a particular consideration. It is then said, "*ye are of your father the devil.*" If the devil was the father of the unbelieving Jews whom our Lord here addressed, it is plain they were his sons or children. The question then is, what devil was their father? Professor Stuart shall inform us. In his letters to Dr. Miller, p. 95—99. he thus writes:

"The word *son* was a favourite one among the Hebrews; and was employed by them, to designate a great variety of relations. The *son of any thing*, according to oriental idiom, may be either *what is closely connected with it, dependant on it, like it, the consequence of it, worthy of it, &c.* But this view of the subject must be explained, by actual examples from the Scriptures. The following I have selected from the Old and New Testaments.

"*The son of eight days*, i.e. the child that is eight days old; *the son of one hundred years*, i.e. the person who is one hundred years of age; *the son of a year*, i.e. a yearling; *the son of my sorrow*, i.e. one who has caused me distress; *the son of my right hand*, i.e. one who will assist or be a help to me; *son of old age*, i. e. begotten in old age; *son of valor*, i.e. bold, brave; *son of Belial*, [lit. son of good-for-nothing,] i.e. a worthless man; *son of wickedness*, i.e. wicked; *son of a murderer*,

i.e. a murderous person; *son of my vows*, *i.e.* son that answers to my vows; *son of death*, *i.e.* one who deserves death; *son of perdition*, *i.e.* one who deserves perdition; *son of smiting*, *i.e.* one who deserves stripes; *son of Gehenna*, *i.e.* one who deserves Gehenna; *son of consolation*, *i.e.* one fitted to administer consolation; *son of thunder*, *i.e.* a man of powerful, energetic eloquence or strength; *son of peace*, *i.e.* a peaceable man; *son of the morning*, *i.e.* morning star; *son of the burning coal*, *i.e.* sparks of fire; *son of the bow*, *i.e.* an arrow; *son of the threshing floor*, *i.e.* grain; *son of oil*, *i.e.* fat; *son of the house*, *i.e.* domestic or slave; *son of man*, *i.e.* man, as it is usually applied; but perhaps in a sense somewhat diverse, in several respects, as applied to the Saviour.

“Such is the wide extent of relation, similarity, connexion, &c. which the term *son* is employed to designate in the Hebrew, and in the Hebrew idiom of the New Testament; a latitude far greater than is given to it in the Occidental languages; and which no one, who is not conversant with the Hebrew, can scarcely estimate in an adequate manner.

“In collecting and translating these idioms, I have, of course, followed the phraseology of the original languages to which they belong, and not our English version; which not unfrequently paraphrases them, in order to render them intelligible to the English reader.

“Nor are the Hebrew of the Jewish Scriptures and Hebrew-Greek of the New Testament, the only languages which exhibit this latitude of construction in respect to the word *son*. The same idiom runs through all the Shemitish languages. In the Syriac version of the Scriptures, made, as is most probable, not long after the death of the apostles, and in a language which approximates nearest of all to the vernacular dialect of the Jews in our Saviour’s time, the

word in question is used in a still greater latitude. The following instances are collected from this version.

"*A son of trade*, i.e. *συντεχνος*, or one of the same trade, fellow workmen; *son of a great family*, i.e. a nobleman; *son of my yoke*, i.e. my companion; *son of foster-fathers*, i.e. *συντροφος*, and associate in education or pupilage; *son of flesh*, i.e. a relative; *son of adultery*, i.e. a person of illegitimate birth; *son of his day*, i.e. a contemporary; *son of his hour*, i.e. forthwith, immediately; *son of the neck*, i.e. a collet; *sons of inheritance*, i.e. heirs; *sons of the place*, i.e. dwelling together; *sons of the city*, i.e. fellow citizens; *sons of the tribe*, i.e. members of the same tribe; *sons of the people*, i.e. Gentiles; *sons of the company*, i.e. fellow travellers; *sons of my years*, i.e. my equals in age; *sons of the nobles*, i.e. free-men; *sons of Crete*, i.e. Cretans; *sons of idols*, i.e. idolaters.

"To these idioms, taken from the Syriac version of the Scriptures, may be added others belonging to the language; e.g. *the son of secrecy*, i.e. privy counsellor; *son of the oaks*, i.e. of noble progeny; *the son of similitude*, i.e. most like; *son of heresy*, i.e. a heretic; *son of nature*, i.e. of the same nature; *a son of two portions*, i.e. one who receives a double portion of inheritance; *son of the leopards*, i.e. Bacchus; *son of dividing*, i.e. one who divides the inheritance with another; *son of the month*, i.e. of the same month; *son of the year*, i.e. a contemporary; *son of opinion*, i.e. one holding the same sentiments.

"Besides these, most of the instances already adduced above from the Hebrew idiom, are found in the Syriac; together with other cases of a similar kind, which I forbear to cite.

"In the Arabic language, the idiom in question is still more striking; because we have the language in much fuller extent than in the Syriac or the Hebrew.

Here we find, besides many of the idioms already quoted, *sons of the land*, i.e. strangers; *son of familiarity*, i.e. intimate friend, *son of moonshine*, i.e. a night resplendent with moonbeams; *son of the night*, i.e. a dark night; *son of misfortune*, i.e. in trouble; *son of the days*, i.e. unfortunate; *son of destroying*, i.e. warlike; *son of freedom*, i.e. innocent; *son of the way*, i.e. a traveller; *son of the sun*, i.e. Aurora, or morning light; *son of the clouds*, i.e. rain, also coolness; *son of time*, i.e. a day and a night; *son of the night* i.e., the moon; *son of the day*, i.e. a day.

“These are only a part of the instances which occur, of the idiomatic use of the word *son* in Arabic. More might easily be added: but I deem it unnecessary.

“The object of all the specimens which I have exhibited of the use of the term *son*, in the Shemitish languages, is to make it evident how very vague, indefinite, and extensive, the secondary significations of this word are; and how different the genius of the oriental languages, which thus employ it, is, from that of our own language, or from those of Europe in general.

“Every kind of relation or resemblance whether real or imaginary, every kind of connexion, is characterised by calling it the son of that thing to which it stands thus related, or with which it is connected.”

The Professor adds on the same page, and it suits my purpose equally as it did his, by merely substituting *son of the devil* for the phrase *son of God*. “It will be remembered, however, that when we investigate the meaning of the phrase *son of the devil*, in the Scriptures, we are investigating the *usus loquendi* of a Shemitish dialect. This will of course be conceded, in regard to the phrase in the Old Testament; and I may add, that all critics are now agreed, that although the *words* of the New Testament are Greek,

the idiom is Hebrew." Mr. Stuart then tells us that "*the son of any thing, according to oriental idiom, may be either what is closely connected with it, dependant on it, like it, the consequence of it, worthy of it, &c.*" He adds, "*every kind of relation or resemblance, whether real or imaginary, every kind of connexion is characterised by calling it the son of that thing to which it stands thus related, or with which it is connected.*" It is a plain case then, that if the Jews were of their father the devil, or sons of the devil, and if the term devil means a *slanderer*, our Lord only told them that they were "slandrous persons." Were they not closely connected with slander, depended on it, were like it, and worthy of it? Mr. Stuart, by the above remarks, forever settles the question, that neither here nor any where else, son of the devil refers to a fallen angel. I might here close my remarks, but I shall briefly notice what is further said in the passage, that we may see how it agrees with the view which he has given us. It is then said, "*and the lusts of your father ye will do.*" Well, did not the Jews slander the Saviour? They certainly did. But it is said, "*He was a murderer from the beginning.*" We have seen from the above quotation, that "son of wickedness," simply means "wicked;" and that "son of a murderer" signifies "a murderous person." That the Jews were murderous persons no one disputes. But, it will be said, how were the Jews murderous persons from the beginning of the world? This is not said. They are only said to have been "murderers from the *beginning.*" The term *arhes*, here rendered the beginning, is used to express, the beginning of our Lord's ministry and miracles, John 8 : 25. 6 : 64. 15 : 27. 16 : 4. and 2 : 11. 1 John 1 : 1. 2 : 7. 13, 14, 24. and 3 : 11. 2d. Epistle, verses 5, 6. In short, it is used to express the beginning of persons and things in a variety of ways. See Rev. 1 : 8. 3 : 14. 21 : 6. and 22 : 13. Mark 1 : 1. Philip 4 : 15.

2: 3. Luke 1: 2. 2 Thess. 2: 13. Acts 11: 1. Heb. 7: 3. Acts 26: 5. Matth. 24: 8. Mark 1: 1. Heb. 3: 14. Col. 1: 18. In the following it refers to the beginning of the world; Heb. 1: 1. Matth. 19: 4, 8. and 24: 21. Mark 10: 6. Jer 3: 4. But let the reader notice, that in these some additional phrase or circumstance is introduced, showing that the beginning of the world is intended. We are not left to infer this, merely from the beginning. Such are all the places where this is to be found, except John 1: 1. where it is said "the beginning was the Word." This forms no singular exception to its general usage. See the Trinitarian controversy respecting this.

The only other text which can be deemed an exception, is 1 John 3: 8. which will be considered separately. But it is not necessary to confine its application to the beginning of the gospel dispensation, for every same devil the Jews were of, had been from the beginning of the world; had deceived Eve, and tempted to murder his brother Abel. The Jews had "murderous persons" from the beginning of the present dispensation, as all will allow who have read our Gospels. From our Lord's birth to his death they sought to slay him. In verses 37, 40. he rebuked the Jews of seeking to kill him; and this he did because his *word* had no place in them, verse 37. they abode not in the truth; there was no truth in them. They were of their father the devil. This was, is explained verse 23. "Ye are from the world,—ye are of this world." "And whosoever sinneth sin is the servant of sin," verse 34. And verse 3: 31. our Lord told them, "he that is of the world is earthy and speaketh of the earth." What then to be from beneath, of this world, and of the flesh? Was it not to judge after the flesh, or from earthly corrupt principles and lusts? verse 15.

If the Jews had abode in the truth, or Christ's word had been in them, they would not have been murderous persons, or made God's law void through their traditions. Had they believed Moses, they would have believed in Jesus, for he wrote of him John 5 : 45—47. Perhaps it will be said—Are not the Jews expressly distinguished from the devil who is called their father? Son and father must in this case be the same. Professor Stuart informs us above and I think correctly, that "*son of a murderer*" is simply a Hebrew idiom for "*a murderous person*." The Jews were so, and they spoke a lie and were the fathers of it. What lie did they speak? They said verses 39, 40. "Abraham is our father." They lied for says our Lord to them—"if ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth which I have heard of God: this did not Abraham." He adds, verse 41. "ye do the deeds of your father." What father? What they had seen or learned from their own evil lusts and passions; and this accords with the source from which all evil proceed stated by James chap. 1 : 14, 15. and many other passages.

We have seen that the principle of evil was not only personified but deified. In this passage, and others, it is spoken of as a person or being. Eve's lust said to her, "ye shall not surely die," which was a lie. It is in the passage before us represented as the father of lies, and the lusts or desires of this father the Jews did. Lust from the beginning abode not in the truth, for it was by lust conceiving contrary to the commandment, the first deviation from truth was made, and the first lie told; and when lust said "ye shall not surely die," it was not only a liar but the father of it. From our mother Eve to the present day, all men who listen to the lies of their own lust

contrary to God's commandments, have found that the ways of transgressors are hard. Men obeying the voice of their lusts, murder themselves, are led to murder others, and have turned the world into a Golgotha. The more effectually to deceive ourselves, while lust is the true cause of all the mischief, an imaginary being has been invented and believed in, to bear all the blame of it.

In concluding these remarks I would ask every candid man, Did our Lord mean to tell the Jews that they were of their father a fallen angel? and that the lusts of this fallen angel they would do? And did he mean, that this fallen angel was a murderer from the beginning? That this wicked being abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him? And that "when he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar and the father of it?" Yes, all this is confidently asserted to be our Lord's meaning. But why should it be believed, until it is first proved, that an angel fell from heaven and became a devil? The belief of this is premature, until it is shown, that such a being really exists. To say he was a murderer from the beginning of the world, and refer to Gen. 3. will not do, for we have shown, that the serpent that deceived Eve was not a fallen angel; nor is such a being once mentioned in the Old Testament. Nor will it answer any better to refer to Cain's murder of Abel, for not a single hint is dropped, that the devil or a fallen angel had any concern with it. Besides, when the Scriptures trace crimes to their source in plain language, they never refer them to the devil, but to lust within men, see James 4: 1—16. and 1: 13—16. Matth. 15: 18—21.

1 John 3: 8, 9, 10. "He that committeth sin, is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.

Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness, is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." This, and the preceding passage, were written by the same person. The language and sentiment of both are similar, and the quotations and remarks made are applicable to both. We shall add some brief remarks here. John says, "*He that committeth sin is of the devil.*" He was writing to Christians, who were the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, and could not say to them as he did to the unbelieving Jews, "ye are of your father the devil." It appears from verse 7. that he said this to guard them against sin. Comp. John 8: 34. and Rom. 6: 10—23. "*For the devil sinneth from the beginning.*" This corresponds to John 8: 44. "*He was a murderer from the beginning.*" What devil sinned or was a murderer from the beginning? Answer; at verse 15. it is said—"whosoever *hateth* his brother is a murderer," and at verse 12. "not as Cain who was of that wicked one and slew his brother." Cain, like the Jews, was of his father the devil, and the lusts of his father he did: This father was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth. And what was this? No man will assert that Moses intimates a fallen angel influenced Cain to slay Abel. If he that *hateth* his brother is a murderer, Cain was one before he slew Abel. It was from this *hatred* in his heart the bloody deed proceeded, and which in the eye of both God and man constitutes murder. Well, let it be recollected, that the very first time *satan* is mentioned in Scripture, the term is applied to a well, and the explanation given us in the margin is *hatred*. See Sect. 3. Besides, in Sect. 2. it has been shown, that *Eve's*

lust or desire when it had conceived brought forth sin: and this devil sinned from the beginning. It came to be personified, yea, was deified, as we have seen in Sections 3, 4. is called *satan* in the book of Job, and devil and *satan* in other parts of Scripture. This view is agreeable to the passage, for it is said—“he that committeth sin is of the devil.” It is added, “*for this purpose the son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.*” What then were the works of the devil? 1st. All agree that sin is the work of the devil. What then produces sin? James says, chap. 1: 15. “then, lust when it hath conceived bringeth forth sin.” Is it not plain that lust is the devil? Compare Mark 7: 21, 22. 2d. Death is also the work of the devil. Death entered by sin, and sin entered by lust conceiving and bringing it forth; and when sin is finished it bringeth forth death. The wages of sin is death, see Rom. 5: 12. and 6: 23. Death is the offspring of sin, sin is the offspring of lust; or lust was the occasion of the second, and these two the occasion of the first. Was the son of God manifested then to destroy sin? This is expressly declared, verse 5. “And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.” We think few can dispute, that “to take away our sins” in this verse, is the same as to destroy the works of the devil in the passage before us; and in both Christ is said to be manifested to do this. Yea, through death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the devil. See on Heb. 2: 14. below. Does the son of God by his manifestation destroy death? Nothing can be more explicitly stated than this. “I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O! death, I will be thy plagues; O! grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes.” Hos. 13: 14. See 1 Cor. 15: 53—58. At verse 26.

it is expressly declared, "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." Suffer me now to ask—Is it any where said Christ was manifested to destroy a fallen angel? This I think no man will affirm. Why then is it so confidently affirmed that the devil is a fallen angel?

Heb. 2: 14, 15. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and deliver them, who through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." As this is also one of the principal texts, relied on for proof of the existence of a fallen angel, called the devil, we shall give it all due attention. Supposing then that we admit for a moment the existence of such a being as the devil, what follows from this passage? It follows, that he is to be destroyed, for it is expressly said, Christ died, that "through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, *that is the devil.*" But do our orthodox friends allow that he is to be destroyed through the death of Jesus Christ? No, they aver, that he is to exist forever, the enemy of God and the tormentor of men. But if this text teaches his existence, it as certainly teaches his destruction. I urge then the belief of both, or the rejection of both doctrines. But this is not all, for if this text teaches the devil to be a fallen angel, it as explicitly declares that he has *the power of death*. By the power of death is generally understood power to produce death, and retain men in this state when dead. But is it not a very extraordinary supposition, that such a wicked being should have such a power? Besides, is it not contrary to other parts of Scripture, where God says, "I kill and I make alive; I bring down to the grave and also bring up again." Can any one think God has dele-

gated this power to the devil? Job calls death the king of terrors, but not because the devil has the power of it. By taking into view other parts of Scripture we find death ascribed to a very different cause than the power of a fallen angel. In Rom. 5: 12. we are told that by one man sin entered into the world *and death by sin*. And in chap. 6: 23. that the wages of sin is death, but not a word is said as if the devil had any concern with it. James, chap. 1: 15. also says, that when "sin is finished it bringeth forth death," but says not a word about the devil having any power to produce it or continue it. Nor does the apostle say the sting of death is the devil, but the sting of death is sin. Besides, when speaking of the victory obtained by Jesus Christ over death, the apostle does not say—"O! devil, where is thy power over death," but says "O! death, where is thy sting, O! grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." The apostle here renders thanks to God for victory over sin, and the law which is the strength of sin, and also over death, but renders no thanks to God through Jesus Christ for victory over a fallen angel or the devil. Can any candid man then think, that if such a being had power over death, that Paul, in giving thanks to God, would have omitted thanking him for victory over this malignant, wicked being, who had so long and universally exercised it? We should rather think, that had Paul believed this, victory over the devil would have been one of the principal things he would have mentioned.

What then, it may be asked, is the devil referred to in this passage? I answer, whatever has the power of death. What then has the power of death? I

answer, sin and the law the strength of sin, by which death came first to be introduced, and by which it hath passed through to all the human race. See Rom. 5: 12, 13. The judgment, Gen. 3: 19. was by one to condemnation. Death reigned by one man's offence, and no power of man has been able to resist his universal sway; and but for the death of Christ, and his resurrection from the dead, no hope of a resurrection by man could ever be entertained.

But let us examine the passage itself a little more particularly. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." Well, for what purpose did he take part in flesh and blood? "That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil." We have shown on 1 John 3: 8. what the *works* of the devil are, and that Christ was manifested to destroy them. But here Christ is said to *destroy the devil himself*. Sin and death, we saw there, were the works of the devil, and that Christ is actually to destroy those works. What devil was it then which produced such works? Such is the workmanship, but what devil was the workman? James tells us in plain words—"then when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin; and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." Christ by his death would accomplish very little to the purpose, to destroy a fallen angel, or even to destroy sin and death, if lust which bringeth forth sin was not destroyed. It would only be like lopping off the branches from a poisonous tree, while the stock from which they all sprung, was allowed to remain. But Christ by his death, is not only to destroy sin and death, the works of the devil, but *lust* or *the devil*. He is not only to destroy the workmanship but the workman, not merely the branches but the root, not only the streams of sin and death, but the fountain

from which they have flowed. He is to destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil. See the following passages: Col. 1 : 20. Eph. 1 : 10. 1 Cor. 15. But it ought further to be noticed, that "*the strength of sin is the law.*" It is this which makes sin to be what it is, for sin is the transgression of the law, and where there is no law there is no transgression. The law has always said—"the soul that sinneth shall die." The law of Moses entered that the offence might abound. It gendered to bondage, and was the ministration of death. 2 Cor. 3 : 7. comp. Rom. 5 : 20, 21. Gal. 4 : 24. It could not give life, but cursed every one who did not continue in all things written in the book of the law to do them. Gal. 3 : 21, 10. Well, did Christ through death abolish the law? The word which is in this passage rendered *destroy*, Parkhurst says, means, "to render ineffectual, abolish, annul, destroy." It is the same word which in 2 Cor. 3 : 7. is rendered *done away*, and applied to the law of Moses, which was done away in Christ: and is rendered *abolished*, Eph. 2 : 15. when speaking of this very law. "Having *abolished* in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances." It is also rendered *abolished*, 2 Tim. 1 : 10. where it is said of Christ, "who hath *abolished* death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." This then is agreeable to the fact, for by the death of Christ the law was abolished. Christ through death destroyed or abolished the law, which was the strength of sin, and denounced death on the transgressor. It had the power of death, and might with as much propriety be called the devil or accuser as the writing, Ezra 4 : 6. was called a satan or adversary to the Jews. The law is expressly said to have been the *accuser* of the Jews, John 5 : 45—47.

But it is added—"and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." The Jews were kept in bondage under the law. But Christ delivers from this bondage, Rom. 8 : 15. 5 : 1. 8 : 1. and 8 : 14. Whoever believes in Christ, is delivered not only from the law which is the strength of sin, but is led to crucify his flesh with its affections and lusts. And he is delivered from the fear of death, by the knowledge of life and immortality brought to light by the gospel. Indeed, the ultimate end of the death of Christ, is to bring men to a state of incorruption and glory. See 1 Cor. 15.

Acts 13 : 10. "O! full of all subtilty, and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness; wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" The quotation from Professor Stuart, on John 8 : 44. above, equally illustrates this passage. The term devil signifies a slanderer. Child of a slanderer, according to Mr. Stuart, signifies "a slanderous person," as son of a murderer, means "a murderous person." In fact, Paul, verse 8. gives for substance this very explanation. "Elymas the sorcerer withstood them, seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith." Being full of all subtilty and mischief, he was a satan or devil, in opposing and slandering the faith of Christ.

Matth. 13 : 39. "The enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels." The whole of this context is considered in the Second Part, to which the reader is referred. Here we shall only make a few brief remarks as to the devil of which this passage speaks. 1st. The tares said to be sown in the field, are called, verse 38. "the children of the wicked one." The word one is in *italic*, and the meaning is, "wicked

persons.” See Mr. Stuart’s remarks quoted above on John 8 : 44. The question then is, did a fallen angel mix those wicked children with the children of the kingdom? This must be affirmed, by those who say that the devil is a fallen angel. But though this is asserted, we have never seen any proof of it, nor will it be easily explained, how such a being could do this. Besides, we do not perceive what need there was for the services of such a being to produce such a crop. 2d. What then is meant by the devil that sowed the tares? In the Second Part we have shown, that the tares were the unbelieving Jews, who at the end of the world or age were destroyed. Well, what evil sowed them? The same devil or satan who put into the heart of Judas to betray Jesus. No other evil was required to produce a crop of tares or wicked men, but the evil principles of their own hearts, for they were of their father the devil and the lusts of their father they did. See on John 8 : 44. above.

Matth. 25 : 41. “Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.” This passage must again be noticed in the Second Part, in considering Matth. chaps. 24, 25. Here I shall only notice the following things. 1st. It has been proved, we think beyond all controversy, that the unbelieving, persecuting Jews are repeatedly called the devil and satan. See the preceding passages in this Section and also Section 5. 2d. It has also been proved, that the angels or messengers of his satan, were the false teachers, or those who joined with the persecuting Jews in opposing the gospel and persecuting those who preached it. See on 1 Cor. 11 : 14. and 12 : 7. in Section 5. See also the next Section. As this will not be disputed, let us, 3d. Notice the everlasting fire which is here said to

be prepared for the devil and his angels. This everlasting fire, is not said to have been prepared for those whom our Lord is represented as addressing thus—"depart from me ye cursed." No; it is said to have been prepared for the persecuting Jews and their angels or messengers. What then was this everlasting fire? In my Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus and Gehenna, chap. 2. sect. 3. the following things have been shown at length, and to which I refer the reader. It has been shown, that *fire* is a figure used in Scripture to express God's temporal judgments on any people. The phrase, "everlasting fire," has also been shown to refer to the temporal judgments of God which came on the Jews in the destruction of their city and temple, and is that punishment which they have been suffering for nearly two thousand years, and are still enduring. It has also been shown, that the phrase "everlasting fire," is used as an equivalent expression for "hell fire." If all these, and other things connected with this subject, have been shown there, and need not be repeated here. See on this also 2 Thess. chap. 1. considered in the Second Part of this work. 4th. To whom did our Lord refer when he said, "depart from me ye cursed" into everlasting fire, not *prepared for them*, but for the unbelieving Jews and their messengers? The answer to this question will be given in considering Matth. chaps. 24, 25, in the Second Part, referred to, which to avoid repetition we shall omit here.

Acts 10: 38. "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with him." Our Lord healed those who were possessed with *demons*, and cast them out: but it is no where said that he cast out *diaboloi*, *devils*; and this is the only place where he is

said to have healed those who were *oppressed of the devil*. In curing persons he often commanded the demons to depart from them, yet on no occasion does he ever speak to *diabolos*, the devil, and command him to depart. His temptation in the wilderness may be thought an exception to this remark, which will be considered in its place. If the devil, a fallen angel, inflicted bodily diseases in those days, we can see no good reason why he should not in these, for no one can think that his power is contracted or his malice abated by the lapse of seventeen centuries. But who in our day ascribes diseases to the devil? If it is done it is merely in compliance with a popular mode of speaking. The question will then be asked—what devil were those persons oppressed with, for it is said our Lord healed all who were oppressed of the devil? In answer to this, let it be observed, that Peter is here evidently speaking of our Lord's kindness in healing men of diseases generally, whatever they were. They are spoken of in the aggregate, and are called being "*oppressed of the devil*." This is in perfect agreement with what has been stated Sections 3. and 4. that satan, the devil, or Ahraman, was the author of all evil, just as much as the good god Yazdan, was the author of all good. That the Jews had imbibed such an opinion, and used language in accordance with it, has been shown. Ascribing all diseases here to the oppression of the devil, shows that Peter spoke in accordance with this popular opinion. This our Lord did, in saying, that satan had bound a woman eighteen years with an infirmity. Satan is also said to have afflicted Job, but it has been shown, that this very account is introduced, for the purpose of refuting such an opinion, and establishing that God is the author of afflictions as well as of prosperity.

Eph. 4 : 27. "Neither give place to the devil." In the preceding verse the apostle exhorts—"be ye

angry and sin not ; let not the sun go down upon your wrath." He immediately adds—"neither give place to the devil." What devil? Evidently *wrath* ; for by letting the sun go down upon their wrath, they gave place to this devil ; or, it gave occasion to the enemies of the gospel to speak reproachfully. It is not easy to understand how by anger they gave place to a fallen angel. Besides, men's wrathful passions are ascribed to themselves in Scripture. See James 4 : 1—6.

Eph. 6 : 11. "Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil." See the whole context. See also all the other texts where the enemies of Christianity are called the devil and satan. What in this verse is called collectively the devil, is thus particularised, verse 12. "*For we wrestle not against flesh and blood,*" or, we wrestle not *merely* with men. For this sense of the phrase *flesh and blood*, see the following among other texts, Matth. 16 : 17. 1 Cor. 15 : 50. Gal. 1 : 16. Heb. 2 : 14. "*But against principalities,*" or supreme governors. For this sense of the word *principalities*, see Rom. 8 : 38. Tit. 3 : 1. "*Against powers,*" or, against magistrates clothed with authority. See for this sense of the word *powers*, Rom. 13 : 1—3. It seems to include supreme rulers both civil and ecclesiastical. See Luke 12 : 11. Col. 1 : 16. Eph. 1 : 21. Col. 2 : 10. Luke 20 : 20. "*Against the rulers of the darkness of this world.*" Wakefield renders the passage thus—"Clothe yourselves in the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the devices of the accuser. For we not *only* have to wrestle against flesh and blood, but against authority, against the powers, against the rulers, of this dark age ; against the wickedness of spiritual men in a heavenly dispensation." In his note he says, "*viz.* against *Jewish governors*, who have a dispensation of

religion from heaven, as well as against *heathen magistrates*, under the *darkness* of superstition and idolatry." By the *rulers of the darkness of this world*, Dodridge understands the "*heathen rulers* ; and by *flesh and blood* the lower ranks of mankind." These remarks are a sufficient illustration of this passage. If it is asked—What *darkness* did the apostle refer to? I answer, the ignorance, superstition, and wickedness which abounded both among the Jews and Gentiles. Comp. Luke 22 : 53. Col. 1 : 13. It is well known, that principalities and powers, both civil and ecclesiastical, Jewish and heathen, were opposed to the gospel. They were the rulers of this darkness, and the people were often excited against Christianity by the prevailing ignorance and popular superstitions. See Acts 19. For the Scripture usage of the words *spiritual* and *high* or *heavenly places*, compare Rom. 15 : 27. 1 Cor. 9 : 11. 1 Peter 2 : 5. Col. 3 : 16. John 3 : 12. Eph. 1 : 20. and 3 : 10. A phrase, the reverse of the entire expression, "*spiritual wickedness in high places*," occurs Eph. 1 : 3. and assists in explaining it. But, let any one go over this passage, and see if he can give any thing like a rational interpretation of it, on the supposition that the devil referred to was a fallen angel?

1 Tim. 3 : 6, 7. "Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover, he must have a good report of them which are without ; lest he fall into reproach, and the snare of the devil." The question to be settled is—What devil does the apostle refer to? In answer to this let us hear the following writers. Wakefield renders the passage thus—"No novice ; lest he be puffed up, and so fall into blame from the accuser. He ought also to have good testimony from without ; lest he fall into reproach, and a snare of the accuser." See a similar rendering in the Improved Version. McKnight,

on this passage, says—"According to Erasmus, this clause should be translated, '*fall into the condemnation of the accuser.*' A sense which the word *diabolos* hath, verse 11. For he supposes that by the accuser is meant, the persecuting Jews and Gentiles, who were ready to condemn the Christians for every misdemeanor." See remarks on the next passage.

2 Tim. 2 : 24, 25, 26. "And the servant of the Lord must not strive ; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient. In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves ; if God, peradventure, will give them repentance, to the acknowledging of the truth : and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will." The principal question to be considered here is—What is the snare of the devil ? In the preceding text, we saw one in danger of falling into it, and here we read of some being in it, and needing to be recovered out of it. They are described as persons who have not repented, who have not acknowledged the truth, but are opposing themselves to it. The servant of the Lord, in attempting their recovery out of his snare, must not strive, but be gentle unto all men. He must be apt to teach ; he must be patient ; and in meekness he must instruct those in the snare of the devil, or those who oppose themselves, who have not repented and acknowledged the truth. It should seem then, that both from the situation of those persons, and also the way in which they are delivered out of it, that the snare of the devil is their opposition to the gospel, and the various ways and means by which its enemies prevented men from believing it. M'Knight says—"The snare of the devil, out of which the opposers of the gospel are to be taken alive by the servant of the Lord, signifies those prejudices, and errors, and habits of sensuality, which hindered both Jews and Gentiles in the first

age from attending to the evidences of the gospel." In this view the snare of the devil is stated Col. 1: 13. Rom. 6: 17. and their recovery out, Acts 26: 18. and many other similar passages.

James 4: 7. "Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil and he will flee from you." What devil were they called to resist? The preceding verses point out this devil to be envy and pride, or their evil lusts and passions. Comp. chap. 3: 15, 16. and 1: 13. That men's lusts and passions are called the devil and satan in other passages has been shown. Instead of indulging these, we are called to resist them. Comp. verse 8. It is easily understood how we can resist such a devil as this; but we have no ideas, or at least very confused notions on the subject, to understand it of an invisible, fallen angel. The terms devil and satan, being used to designate men's evil lusts and passions, appear to be the foundation of all the other senses in which those terms are used in Scripture. It was Judas' evil lusts, which made him a devil, and on account of them these terms are used to designate the enemies of the gospel. In short, it is such evil lusts and passions, which make men satans or devils. Accordingly, it is difficult to decide in some texts, to which these terms are applied. Nor is this of importance to decide; hence, in some texts, we have given both views as agreeable to the Scripture usage of these terms.

Jude 9. "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil (he disputed about the body of Moses) durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, the Lord rebuke thee." Whitby, in his preface to Jude, quoting from Dr. Lightfoot, says; "In citing the story of Michael the archangel, contending with the devil about the body of Moses, verse 9. he doth but the same that Paul doth, in naming Jannes and Jambres, 2 Tim. 3: 8. namely;

allege a story which was current, and owned among that nation, though there was no such thing in Scripture; and so he argueth with them, from their own authors and concessions: for among the Talmudists, there seems to be something like the relics of such a matter, viz. of Michael and the angel of death, disputing, or discoursing, about fetching away the soul of Moses." Jude here, then, only reasons with the persons he addresses, on a received story among them, for the purpose of refuting their wicked conduct in speaking evil of dignities. In this, he acted as our Lord did, in reasoning on the popular opinion, that satan had bound a woman eighteen years, for the purpose of refuting his adversaries. But the truth of this story is no more admitted in the one case, than the correctness of the opinion is in the other. Both are introduced merely for the sake of argument, without any regard to their truth or falsehood. This story about Michael and the devil must have been invented about the time of the Babylonish captivity or soon after it. Before the captivity we never read of angels having names. Nor before the captivity, does it appear, that the Jews knew any thing about a fallen angel called the devil and satan. Besides, the words which Michael used in dispute with the devil, "the Lord rebuke thee," are taken from Zachariah 3: 2. and it is well known that Zachariah prophesied during the captivity. See on this passage Sect. 3. The following quotation from Jahn, not only shows us, that similar opinions to that in the passage before us existed among the Jews, but when and how they came to adopt them. He says, pages 235—6. "The more recent Hebrews, adhering too strictly to the letter of their Scriptures, exercised their ingenuity, and put in requisition their faith, to furnish the monarch Death with a subordinate agent or angel, מלאך המות, viz. the prince of bad spirits 'אֵלֶּה

αβολος, otherwise called Sammael, and also Ashmedai, and known in the New Testament by the phrases, *the prince of this world, the tempter, who hath the power of death*. The Hebrews, accordingly in enumerating the attributes and offices of the prime minister of the terrific king of Hades, represent him as in the habit of making his appearance in the presence of God, and demanding at the hand of the Divinity the extinction, in any given instance, of human life. Having obtained permission to that effect, he does not fail of making a prompt exhibition of himself to the sick; he then gives them drops of poison, which they drink and die. Comp. John 14: 30. Hebrews 2: 14. Hence originate the phrases, "*to taste of death*," and "*to drink the cup of death*," which are found also among the Syrians, Arabians, and Persians, Matt. 16: 28. Mark. 9: 1. Luke 9: 27. John 8: 52. Heb. 2: 9." It appears from this quotation, that "*the more recent Hebrews*," furnished death with an angel, the prince of bad spirits, called Sammael, Ashmedai, the devil, the prince of this world, the tempter. But the ancient Hebrews knew nothing about such a being; and where could "the more recent Hebrews" imbibe such opinions but during their captivity, and from their intercourse with the heathen? See Section 4. Jahn allows, that "adhering too strictly to the letter of their Scriptures," they "exercised their ingenuity" to get their Scriptures to favor such opinions. Christians have imbibed the Jewish opinions, and have exercised like ingenuity to find proof for them in the New Testament.

Rev. 2: 10. "Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days; be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." It will not be questioned, that what John calls satan, verses 9, 13,

24. and chap. 3: 9. he here calls the devil. See remarks on all these passages, Section 5. which are here sufficient for an illustration. Suffer me to ask, does any one believe that the devil, a fallen angel, ever cast Christians into prison? No; but the adversaries of Christianity, then, and since, have often done this. It will not answer to say, the devil, a fallen angel, influenced the enemies of the gospel to cast Christians into prison, for this is just taking for granted the point in question. But, are our orthodox brethren aware, that their faith in the devil influencing men to sin, militates against the doctrine of total depravity? What need is there of such a being's assistance? Total depravity is sufficient without him to produce all manner of wickedness. If men would be less wicked, without the devil's influence, then they are not so bad but he can make them worse: and who can tell but they might all be very good if he would only let them alone? Mankind are wicked enough, but all their wickedness arises from a different source. "From whence come wars and fightings? Come they not hence of your lusts which war in your members?" Is the assistance of a fallen angel required to produce them? But the reader may pursue these reflections at his leisure.

SECTION VII.

ALL THE PASSAGES CONSIDERED, IN WHICH THE TERMS
DEVIL AND SATAN ARE USED SYNONIMOUSLY.

THE first passages which present themselves for our consideration are Matth. 4: 1—12. Mark 1: 12, 13. and Luke 4: 1—14. and which contain an account of our Lord's temptation. The reader will please turn to them and read them. Most religious people interpret this account literally. But concerning a literal interpretation, Essenus thus writes, p. 117—120. "The history of our Lord's temptation is commonly understood in a literal sense. Satan is supposed to be a real being; to have actually appeared and conversed with our Saviour. Having taken him up through the air to the top of the temple, and thence to some high mountain, he tempted him in the manner represented in the narrative. This interpretation is loaded not only with difficulties, but even with absurdities shocking to common sense. The learned Mr. Farmer has examined the question; and his objections to the literal translation are so numerous and decisive, that no thinking person can accede to it, without abandoning the first and most obvious principle of reason, and the tenor of the gospel. 'Why the devil at all assaulted our Lord, and what advantage he could possibly gain over him, has, he observes, always been acknowledged to be a great difficulty, by the advocates of the common interpretation.' But this difficulty is increased by the manner the devil proposed his temptation to our Lord. For he came to him in person, and urges temptations

such as could proceed only from an evil being. Now with what prospect of success could he tempt our Lord, if he thus exposed himself to open view? By a personal and undisguised appearance, he can never hope to prevail over the feeblest virtues, much less could he expect the illustrious person, whom he knew to be the Son of God, and who knew him to be the devil, to comply with his temptations.

“In the first temptation, in which Jesus is solicited to turn stones into bread, nothing is promised on the part of satan to gain his consent; the request of an implacable enemy, when no advantage attends it, being in itself a reason for rejecting it. But satan defeats his own temptation by asking an useless favor.

“While the foe betrays great folly in the first temptation, he supposes Christ to be actuated by still greater in the second. The people, on seeing Jesus throwing himself from the top of the temple, might conclude that he was the Son of God. But he knew that the tempter had it in his power to lead them to draw the same conclusion of himself. Satan also would throw himself down unhurt; and his miraculous preservation would prove him, as well as Jesus, to be the Son of God. Nay, he might claim the superiority; for it was a greater exertion of power to convey him from the wilderness to the top of the temple, than in sustaining his fall to the court below. What inducement, then, could Christ have for a compliance with the proposal suggested? Would he be disposed to gratify satan, by doing an act at his mere suggestion? Was he to acquire any glory, or advantage to himself? No; on the contrary, he would only have incurred the infamy of having entered the lists with the devil, without having acquired any superiority over him.

“With regard to the third temptation, the Son of God knew that the father of lies had not the empire

world at his disposal, and that he therefore
 ed what he had not power to perform. Such
 ise was rather an insult than a temptation, and
 alculated only to provoke scorn or resentment.

the devil then hope by such contemptuous
 ent, to engage the Son of God to listen to his
 ed counsels; and to seduce him to an act of
 ghest dishonor to his heavenly Father, that of
 g divine homage to this infernal spirit? This
 retation represents the old serpent as acting
 out of character, and supposes him to be as
 of policy as he is of goodness; inasmuch as he
 the least art in proposing temptations, where
 eatest would have been insufficient to insure
 ss.

detracts from the dignity and sanctity of the
 mer, to be seen in conference with, and under
 nder of, an unclean spirit, who transports at his
 ire his sovereign and his judge from place to
 ; raises him to the most conspicuous stations to
 e him to public derision; and wantonly and ar-
 tly propounds to him one foolish enterprise after
 er. And as the devil could have no power over
 ord unless by his free consent, Christ must have
 accessory to his own dishonor, danger, and
 ations.

he common opinion further ascribes to satan
 eatest miracles. It supposes that the devil, by
 e a spiritual and invisible agent, has a power of
 ing at pleasure a corporeal or invisible form,
 f speaking with an audible voice; though there
 more ground from experience, (our sole instruc-
 the established law of nature,) to ascribe this
 r to the devil, than to ascribe life to the inani-
 or speech to the brute creation.

is a still greater objection to the common opi-
 that it ascribes to the devil the performance of

things, not only preternatural, but absurd and impossible. Such we must reckon, his showing Christ all the kingdoms of the world from an exceedingly high mountain; for the earth being a spheroidal figure, what single mountain can command a view of all the parts of it, or those in particular which are opposite to each other? The sun itself, at its immense height above the loftiest mountains of our globe, commands and enlightens at once only a single hemisphere. Could the devil, then, from one point of view, show Christ not only the entire circumference of the globe, but also whatever constitutes the glory and grandeur of its kingdoms; and show him such infinitely numerous objects, in situations so distant and so opposite, not gradually and successively, but in one and the same instant of time? This does not seem so properly a miracle, as an absurdity and contradiction."

The question will now probably be asked—If our Lord was not literally tempted of the devil, a fallen angel, how is this account to be understood? Before directly answering this question, we shall make some general remarks on it, in connexion with its context. The following things then appear obvious. It is evident, that our Lord's temptation took place, immediately after the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him, and just before he entered on his public ministry. See the preceding and following contexts. His temptation was passing trial for the work given him to do, and in which he was about to engage. Again; it is equally obvious, that the tempter, devil, or satan, did not lead our Lord out into the wilderness for the purpose of tempting him, but on the contrary, he was led out there by the Spirit of God, to be tempted of the devil. See Matth. 3: 16. 4: 1. and Luke 4: 1. compared with verse 14. Again; all will allow that "the devil, satan," and "the tempter," are used as synonymous terms. Nor

is it less apparent, that our Lord's temptation is related by all the three historians, without any suspicion on their part, that it was to be misunderstood. They use the terms devil, wilderness, satan, Spirit of God, and tempter, as what would be alike easily understood by their readers. But again; it is taken for granted in this account, and is plain from many other parts of Scripture, that our Lord was susceptible of temptation. As he was in "all points tempted like as we are," he must have had all things in common with us, to render him susceptible of temptation. To deny this, is to say Jesus was not a partaker in flesh and blood with the children, Heb. 2: 14. that he was not tempted, for without such things we may as well speak of tempting a tree or a stone. But he suffered being tempted, and is able to succour them that are tempted, Heb. 2: 15. He was hungry, and thirsty, and weary as we are: he was sorrowful, and joyful, felt pain and enjoyed ease. In short, he was pleased and angry, Mark 3: 5. was grateful for kindness, and felt an insult, as could be shown if it were necessary. Many good people seem to forget, that sin does not consist in having such appetites and passions, but in their indulgence in a way and to an extent, which God has prohibited. They only become occasions, or render their possessor susceptible of sinning. Jesus was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Heb. 4: 16. I may just add, that the tempter, devil, or satan here mentioned, like the tempter which deceived Eve, professed to be our Lord's friend, and that listening to the proposals made would be for his advantage. This is apparent from comparing the two accounts. With these general remarks in view let us attend to the

1st Temptation of our Lord. "And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterwards an hungered. And when the tempter came to him,

he said, if thou art the Son of God command that these stones be made bread." To fast, in Scripture language, does not always mean total abstinence from food during the period persons are said to fast, but using a less quantity, and coarser kind of food. See the book of Daniel and other passages. When it is said, Luke 4: 2. that our Lord "*did eat nothing*" during forty days, seems, from comparing Acts 27: 33. to mean nothing more than that he had no regular meals. Without a miracle, he could not have lived forty days entirely without food, and no miracle is supposed to have been wrought to sustain him. Nor is it easily perceived, why it would have been sin to turn stones to bread, yet no sin to work a miracle to support nature without food. Our Lord might have been said to have fasted forty days, by eating only of such food as was furnished him by the fields. It is evident that his fasting gave rise to the first temptation. Having fasted forty days, he "was afterwards an hungered." Then the tempter came to him and said—"if thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." What tempter came to him? What other tempter but his *hunger*, for, it was not until they were ended that our Lord hungered? No other tempter in this case was necessary. Unless our Lord was sustained by a miracle, he must have felt the sensations of hunger before they were ended, but it was not until then that his appetite became clamorous for food, and tempted him, by suggesting, "*command that these stones be made bread.*" What said this? Was it not the craving of his bodily appetite for food? It suggested a miracle to be wrought. It has suggested to many since, to steal to satisfy its cravings, and God, who remembers that we are dust, has sometimes interposed by miracle to satisfy it. Even "men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry."

Prov. 6; 30. Comp. verse 31. There are some points of similarity, and dissimilarity, between Eve's temptation and that of our Lord's, which deserve to be noticed. For example; bodily appetite was the tempter in both cases, and in both a dialogue between them and their appetite is represented as having taken place. But notice, when Eve lusted after the fruit, she had all the other trees from which to supply her necessities. Her appetite did not become a tempter to her from want, but took occasion from the restraint, which God had laid on it, in prohibiting the use of one tree of the garden. She listened to the voice of her appetite and sinned, and men who are slaves to their appetites ruin themselves. But our Lord's appetite became a tempter to him from want of food, and attempted to seduce him to work a miracle for a supply. But our Lord repelled the temptation by saying, verse 4. "It is written, man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." He was "tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin," Heb. 4: 15. It was no sin in Eve or our Lord to have the appetite, or to gratify it. It became sin in Eve to gratify her appetite from that which God had prohibited. It would have been sin in Jesus, to have wrought a miracle to gratify his appetite, for his divine power was not given him for this purpose, but to establish his mission as the Saviour of the World. To have complied with the temptation would have shown his want of trust in God, and been an improper exercise of his power for his own personal gratification. To say that our Lord was hungry, yet felt no inclination to enjoy food, is in other words telling us that he was not hungry, and denying that this was any temptation. But feeling all the painful sensations of hunger, and having power to turn stones to bread, yet resisting the suggestion, could only be done by him

who was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, or evil desire.

2d. Our Lord's second temptation is related verse 5—8. "Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, if thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, he shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." What tempter, it will be asked, now assailed our Lord? In order to answer this question several things must be noticed. The scene of this temptation is not laid in the wilderness, but in Jerusalem, and at the temple there, where all the tribes of Israel assembled to worship. Further, the Jews at that time were not only in high expectation of Messiah's appearance, but they expected him to come in a miraculous way for their deliverance and glory. The scene is laid at the place suited to the nature of the temptation. On the other hand, our Lord was just about to enter on the work given him to do. Unless we say that he was ignorant and stoical, we must allow him to feel sensibly, in view of the sufferings which awaited him. In fact, if we admit that he foresaw what afterwards took place, and was not deeply affected by the prospect, yea, wished if possible to avoid it, we must believe him destitute of the common feelings and sinless frailties of our nature. If after he had learned obedience by the things which he suffered, he said, "Father let this cup pass from me," can any man think, that nature would not say the same, yea, suggest some mode of escaping them, when he surveyed the whole scene of suffering at the commencement? To deny this, is to deny that our Lord was a man, and a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. Yea, to deny that our Lord possessed the fine feelings and tender

sensibilities which so conspicuously shone in him. It is in fact saying, our Lord was totally unconcerned about the success of his future ministry among the Jews, that he had no desire that they should receive him as the true Messiah, and that no reflections passed through his mind respecting the best manner in which he might gain the attention and affections of his nation. What then was the tempter? It was *flesh and blood* suggesting the propriety of accommodating himself to the prevailing opinions and expectations of the Jews to secure his success: or, their prevailing expectations and opinions, presented themselves to his mind, pointed out a course, which, if pursued, he would avoid all opposition from them, and be received as their Messiah. What was this? The Jews expected their Messiah to come from heaven, or in a miraculous manner among them. This is generally admitted. It was suggested, cast thyself down from the pinnacle of the temple among them, while at worship in the court below; seeing you fall from such a stupendous height unhurt, they will immediately receive you as the Messiah, and invest you with all the honors, powers, and emoluments of the Jewish church. If, or rather, since thou art the son of God, there can be no danger, "for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." But our Lord did not listen to flesh and blood, reasoning on the principles of accommodation, but repelled the temptation by saying—"it is written, again, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." A compliance with it would have been presumption, a perversion of Scripture in justification of it, and doing evil that good might come. It would have been sacrificing truth at the shrine of prejudice and popular opinion, and shrinking from trials and sufferings through

which he must pass, if he would accomplish the end of his mission. It behoved Christ to suffer, Luke 24 : 46.

3d. The third temptation is stated in verses 8, 9. "Again the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them; and saith unto him, all these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." What devil or tempter now tempted our Lord? It was certainly that which said to him if thou wilt fall down and worship me; and which said, Luke 4 : 6. "All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine." Well, allow me to ask, had a fallen angel all these things at his disposal? Could he confer all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them? No man will say so; nor does our Lord call him a liar or deceiver, in promising such things. What then promised, and could confer all these things on our Lord, if he would fall down before it, worship, or submit to it, as the term worship signifies? I answer; in the days of our Lord the power of the Romans had subdued all the then known world. To whomsoever they would they gave its kingdoms and the glory of them. This was done by the power or force of arms. If our Lord would then make his extraordinary power the means of propagating his kingdom, he might raise himself to the head of the Roman empire, or become master of the whole world. The tempter then was the glory and grandeur of the world presented to the Saviour's mind, to excite his ambition to use his power in raising himself to universal empire. But this temptation he repelled by saying—"get thee hence satan (or adversary) for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." It

is added, that satan departed from him for a season, which intimates that our Lord was assailed with similar temptations afterwards. But was he ever tempted afterwards by a fallen angel or evil spirit? Nothing of the kind appears, but he was certainly tempted afterwards with like temptations to those I have mentioned. In short, these three temptations, are for substance all the various temptations with which our Lord was assailed during his ministry. Indeed, they comprise all that is in the world, which prove tempters to mankind. "The lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," 1 John 2: 16. Was not our Lord, during his ministry, repeatedly hungry, and under temptation to supply his wants by his divine power? Certainly he was, but we find he always resisted such a temptation, and trusted in God for food, in the ordinary course of providence. Again, was he not under strong temptations to sacrifice truth and duty to the prejudices and opinions of the Jews, in order to his ministry being useful among them? No one will deny this. But do we ever find him making sinful compliances with them, to induce them to receive him as their Messiah? No, he was deaf to all such temptations and allurements. Again, during his ministry, he had temptations presented to him to raise himself to a throne, yea, to the empire of the world. The people seeing his power, on one occasion would have come by force to make him a king. But did he encourage them, or avail himself of this, to raise himself to honor and glory? All know that the reverse of this was the case. He was likewise accused of making himself a king. But he repelled the charge by saying his kingdom was not of this world. He was indeed born to be a king, to sway a sceptre over the whole world, and to break in pieces every other kingdom. But his sceptre was a sceptre of righteousness. He was to judge the world

in righteousness, and the people with his truth. He is to reign until all his enemies are made his footstool, but they are to be conquered, not by fire and sword, but by truth and love. All these temptations, our Lord encountered during his ministry, but was more than a match for them all. He suffered being thus tempted, that he might know how to succor them that are tempted to turn aside from truth and duty in his service by similar allurements. But alas! how many "*Vicars of Bray*" have professed to be his servants, who have counted gain godliness, and sacrificed every thing for the honor, the power, and the wealth of the world.

Such are my views of our Lord's temptation, but my limits forbid entering more minutely into a detail of the evidence whereby they might be supported. It is easily perceived, that these views are in accordance with the meaning of the terms devil and satan, as used in other parts of Scripture, and agree to the tempter which tempts men every day. But to understand a fallen angel designated by these terms, is not supported by other parts of Scripture, and involves this account in absurdities and utter impossibilities.

Mark 4: 15. "And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; but when they have heard, satan cometh immediately, and taketh away the word that was sown in their hearts." By comparing Luke 8: 12. the devil is said to do this, and in Matth. 13: 19. it is said to be done by "the wicked one," or rather "the wicked," for *one* is in italic. Satan, devil, and wicked, are all terms used to express the same thing. What satan, devil, or wicked one, then took away the seed of the word sown in men's hearts? It has been shown that the terms devil and satan, are often used to designate the Jews, the adversaries of our Lord and his doctrine. That they were *wicked*

persons no one questions. It is then agreeable to the fact, that as soon as our Lord sowed the good seed of the word they were ready to prevent its salutary effects on the minds of his hearers, by contradicting and blaspheming it. Every scheme was devised by them to excite popular prejudice against our Lord and his doctrine. No assistance from a fallen angel was needed in this case, for we are told such hearers of the word did not *understand* it. What is not understood and believed, is little regarded, soon forgotten, and easily parted with; and especially if public prejudice be against it. If we were even to say, men's evil lusts and passions were the devil and satan that took away the seed of the word from their minds, it would be in agreement with the Scripture usage of these terms. How the seed could be taken away by means of either of these, is easily understood, but how it could be removed by a fallen angel is to me inexplicable. Let it be remembered that it is no where said that such a being made use of them as his tools to accomplish this. See quotations from Jahn, above.

Rev. 12: 9. "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil, and satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." See verses 10, 11, 12. yea, the whole chapter. Again, it is said, Rev. 20: 1, 2. "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and satan, and bound him a thousand years." See verses 7, 8, 9, 10. and indeed the whole chapter. In these two passages, we have John's authority for saying, that the great dragon, old serpent, devil, satan, and accuser of the brethren, all mean the same thing. This thing, or being is also said to deceive

"*the whole world.*" It is from these two passages chiefly, that people conclude that the serpent which deceived Eve was a fallen angel, for here say they, "the devil and satan is called that *old serpent*, and we know that the devil is a fallen angel." And how do they know all this so clearly and confidently? Their fathers, their catechisms, and their ministers have told them so : and this conclusion is drawn too from a book so highly figurative, that no man, minister or sect, has hitherto been able satisfactorily to explain it. Notwithstanding this is frankly owned by every candid man, yet from this very book the strongest proofs are generally adduced for a personal devil, and eternal punishment. We would respectfully ask our orthodox brethren, why they allow the book of Revelations to be highly figurative or symbolical, yet give a literal interpretation to the above passages concerning the serpent, devil, and satan? We would affectionately press it on their attention, why they interpret the parts of these passages concerning the devil and satan literally, and yet would refuse to go through with a literal interpretation of them? I shall give a specimen of the absurdities which such a literal interpretation involves. It must then be believed, that the devil has seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns on his heads. It must also be believed, that he has a tail, and with his tail he drew the third part of the stars of heaven and cast them to the earth. And it must be believed, that Michael and his angels, had a battle with the devil and his angels, and that it was fought in heaven. Besides, our orthodox friends ought to inform us, how the devil got back to heaven to fight this battle there, seeing they believed he fell from heaven before he tempted Eve. In short he has been in heaven and fallen from it a number of times, if such principles of Scripture interpretation are admitted. He fell from

heaven before Eve's temptation. He fell again when the Seventy were out preaching. And John in the above chapters informs us that he was cast out of heaven to the earth a third time. And if *Lucifer* be the devil, he has at least had four falls from heaven, for it is said, how art thou fallen from heaven, Lucifer, son of the morning.

Is it then asked, what this great dragon, that old serpent, the devil and satan was? Dr. Newton says, vol. iii. 135—137, speaking of this dragon—"We find the kings and people of Egypt, who were the great persecutors of the primitive church of Israel, distinguished by this title in several places of the Old Testament: Psalm 74: 13. Isai. 51: 9. Ezek. 29: 3. and with as much reason and propriety may the people and emperors of Rome, who were the great persecutors of the primitive church of Christ be called by the same name, as they are actuated by the same principle. For that the Roman empire was here figured, the characters and attributes of the dragon plainly evince. He is 'a great red dragon:' and purple or scarlet was the distinguishing color of the Roman emperors, consuls, and generals; as it hath been since of the popes and cardinals. His 'seven heads,' as the angel afterwards, 17: 9, 10. explains the vision, allude to the seven mountains upon which Rome was built, and to the seven forms of government, which successively prevailed there. His 'ten horns' typify the ten kingdoms, into which the Roman empire was divided; and the 'seven crowns upon his heads' denote, that at this time the imperial power was in Rome, the high city, as Propertias describes it, seated on seven hills, which presides over the whole world. 'His tail' also, ver. 4. 'drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth;' that is, he subjected the third part of the princes and potentates of the earth: and the Ro-

man empire, as we have seen before, is represented as 'the third part' of the world. 'He stood before the woman, which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born;' and the Roman emperors and magistrates kept a jealous watchful eye over the Christians from the beginning. As Pharaoh laid snares for the male children of the Hebrews, and Herod for the infant Christ, the son of Mary; so did the Roman dragon for the mystic Christ, the son of the church, that he might destroy him even in his infancy. But notwithstanding the jealousy and envy of the Romans, the gospel was widely diffused and propagated and the church brought many children unto Christ, and in time such as were promoted to the empire. 'She brought forth a man-child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron,' ver. 5. It was predicted, that Christ should rule over the nations, Psalm 2: 9. 'Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel:' but Christ, who is himself invisible in the heavens, ruleth visibly in Christian magistrates, princes, and emperors. It was therefore promised before to Christians in general, 2: 26, 27. 'He that overcometh, and keepeth my words unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations (And he shall rule them with a rod of iron: as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers) even as I received of my Father.' But it should seem that Constantine was particularly intended, for whose life the dragon Galerius laid many snares, but he providentially escaped them all; and notwithstanding all opposition, 'was caught up unto the throne of God;' was not only secured by the divine protection, but was advanced to the imperial throne, called 'the throne of God;' for Rom. 13: 1. 'there is no power but of God; the powers that be, are ordained of God.' He too 'ruleth all nations

rod of iron :’ for he had not only the Romans, before had persecuted the church, under his dominion, but also subdued the Scythians, Samaritans, and other barbarous nations, who had never before been subject to the Roman empire : and as the learned Bunsen informs us, there are still extant medals of his with these inscriptions, *the subduer of barbarous nations, the conqueror of all nations, every a conqueror*, and the like. What is added, verse 6, ‘the woman’s flying into the wilderness for a time and two hundred and threescore days’ it is said is a case of prolepsis or anticipation. For the war in which Michael and the dragon, and other subsequent events, were prior in order of time to the casting of the woman into the wilderness : but before the prophet passeth on to a new subject, he giveth a full account of what happened to the woman afterwards, and entereth more into the particulars in proper place.” He says further, p. 138—9.

visible actors in the cause of Christianity were believing emperors and ministers of the word, the martyrs and confessors ; and in support of idolatry the persecuting emperors and heathen magistrates. This contest lasted several years, and the issue of it was, verse 8, 9. that the Christian prevailed over the heathen religion : the heathens were expelled from all rule and authority, and the Christians were advanced to dominion and empire in their stead.

Our Saviour said unto his disciples casting out of the bodies of men, Luke 10: 18. ‘I beheld as lightning, fall from heaven.’ In the same manner satan fell from heaven, and ‘was cast out into the earth,’ when he was thrust out of the imperial throne, ‘and his angels were cast out with him,’ not only all the heathen priests and officers, civil and military were cashiered, but their very gods and de-

mons, who were before adored for their divinity, became the subjects of contempt and execration. It is very remarkable that Constantine himself and the Christians of his time, describe his conquest under the same image, as if they had understood that this prophesy had received its accomplishment in him. Constantine himself, in his epistle to Eusebius and other bishops concerning the re-edifying and repairing of churches, saith, that 'liberty being now restored, and *that dragon* being removed from the administration of public affairs, by the providence of the great God; and by my ministry, I esteem the great power of God to have been made manifest even to all.' "

Such are his remarks on the first of these passages. On the second he says "After the destruction of the beast and of the false prophet, there still remains 'the dragon,' who had delegated his power to them, 'that old serpent, which is the devil and satan :' but he is bound by 'an angel,' an especial minister of providence; and the famous millennium commences, or the reign of the saints upon earth for a thousand years, verse 1—6. 'Binding him with a great chain, casting him into the bottomless pit, shutting him up, and setting a seal upon him,' are strong figures to show the strict and severe restraint which he should be laid under, 'that he might deceive the nations no more,' during the whole period. Wickedness being restrained, the reign of righteousness succeeds, and the administration of justice and judgment is given to the saints of the Most High." p. 205.

He adds, page 215. "At the expiration of the thousand years, verse 7—10. the restraint shall be taken off from wickedness, and for 'a little season' as it was said before, verse 3. 'satan shall be loosed out of his prison,' and make one effort more to re-establish his kingdom. As he deceived our first parents

in the paradisaical state, so he shall have the artifice 'to deceive the nations' in this millennial kingdom, to show that no state or condition upon earth is exempted and secured from sinning." I would only add, that it is *lust* or evil desire "*which deceiveth the whole world,*" and has been the source of its wars and bloodshed, James 4: 1—4. This is the universal deceiver.

We have now finished our investigation of all the texts in the Bible, where the terms devil and satan are used. Having expressed our own views of the different passages, we leave the candid reader to form his own opinions, and make his own reflections on the subject.

SECTION VIII.

ALL THE TEXTS CONSIDERED, WHERE THE DEVIL IS SUPPOSED TO BE CALLED THE EVIL ONE, THE TEMPTER, THE GREAT DRAGON, THE SERPENT, AND OLD SERPENT, THE PRINCE OF THIS WORLD, THE PRINCE OF THE POWER OF THE AIR, AND THE GOD OF THIS WORLD.

THESE names and titles, given to the devil, a supposed fallen angel, will require but a brief consideration, for some of them have been introduced in the preceding sections. Indeed, if *devil* and *satan* designate no such being in the Bible, it will be allowed by most people, that he is not to be found in the Bible. But we shall not take this for granted. The devil is then

1st. Supposed to be called, *o' poneros*, the evil one, or, the wicked one. This word is rendered in the common version, *evil*, *wicked*, *wickedness*, *harm*, &c.

The sacred writers use it to express evil or wickedness in a variety of ways. Such as evil or unclean spirits, Matth. 12 : 45. Acts 19 : 12, 13, 15, 16. Luke 7 : 21. 8 : 2. and 11 : 26. An evil or unclean spirit is the same as an evil or unclean demon, and have no connexion with our present subject. This word is used to express moral evil, Matth. 5 : 37. 1 Thess. 5 : 22. 2 Thess. 3 : 3. John 17 : 15. Physical evil, Acts 28 : 21. Rev. 16 : 2. Matth. 5 : 39. The day of persecution is called the evil day, Eph. 6 : 13. The heart of man, from whence all evil proceeds, is called "an evil heart of unbelief," Heb. 3 : 12. Out of this source proceed evil thoughts, Matth. 9 : 4. Luke 11 : 29. James 2 : 4. Matth. 12 : 35. Luke 6 : 45. Also, wicked and malicious words, 3 John 5 : 10. Matth. 5 : 11. Luke 6 : 22. Also, evil works or deeds, Matth. 12 : 35. Mark 7 : 23. Matth. 15 : 19. Luke 6 : 45. John 3 : 19. and 7 : 7. James 4 : 16. Col. 1 : 21. 2 John 5 : 11. Acts 28 : 21. Rom. 12 : 9. 2 Tim. 4 : 18. Luke 3 : 19. Matth. 7 : 17, 18. Men practising wickedness, are hence called evil, or wicked persons, Matth. 12 : 39. 16 : 4. 7 : 11. and 12 : 34. Luke 11 : 13. 2 Tim. 3 : 13. Luke 6 : 45. 1 Cor. 5 : 13. Matth. 5 : 45. 13 : 49. and 22 : 10. Luke 6 : 35. Acts 17 : 5. 2 Thess. 3 : 2. Such wicked persons have an evil conscience, Heb. 10 : 22. An evil eye, Matth. 6 : 23. and 20 : 15. Mark 7 : 22. Luke 11 : 34. Become evil servants, in various conditions of life, Matth. 18 : 32. and 25 : 26. Luke 19 : 22. And as evil or wickedness prevails, the world or age is said to be evil, Gal. 1 : 4. Such is a brief review of all the places where the word *poneros* occurs, except the following, and are the only passages, where any one can suppose this word designates an evil being or fallen angel.

Matth. 6 : 13. "Deliver us from the evil." See also Luke 11 : 4. where the same language is used. Some have said, this expression means, "deliver us

from the evil *one*," thereby meaning the devil, a fallen angel. But the word *one* does not occur in the original, is not even in the common version, nor does the scope of the passage require it. Such a mode of establishing this doctrine, does not require a serious refutation. In Matth. 13: 19. the phrase "*wicked one*" occurs, but the word *one* is in italic, which might be omitted, or the word person substituted in its place. But as it has been shown in the last section, that this phrase is synonymous to devil and satan, and has no reference to a fallen angel, it requires no further notice here. The same remarks apply to Matth. 13: 38. which has been sufficiently considered already. The expressions "the tares are the children of the wicked," and "the good seed are the children of the kingdom," are explained by the quotation from professor Stuart on John 8: 44. above. "Children of the wicked one," simply means "wicked children" or, "children of wickedness." The Improved Version in a note on this passage says, "sons of the evil one," are wicked men. Such in the Old Testament are called sons of Belial, or worthlessness, i.e. worthless men, 1 Sam. 2: 12. 1 Kings 21: 10. See 2 Cor. 6: 15. In 1 John 2: 13, 14. the phrase "wicked one," is used twice. The word *one* is not put in italic type, but ought to have been, for there is no reason for this alteration. See also Eph. 6: 16. 1 John 3: 12. and 5: 18, 19. where the wicked, or evil one, or thing, is also mentioned. The context of these passages show, that the word *thing*, might be substituted for the word *one*. Take the last passage for an example. The wicked one or thing, which toucheth or rather hurteth not those who are born of God, is that from which they keep themselves, and this is sin, for it is said, "whosoever is born of God sinneth not," verse 18. This is confirmed from verse 19. for John adds, "we know that we are of God, and the whole

world lieth in wickedness, or sin ; or, simply evil. See on all these passages, our remarks on the passages where the devil and satan are mentioned, and which are synonymous terms with evil or wicked one. I shall only add from Wakefield on Matth. 5 : 37. "*The evil one.*" So I render again, verse 39, and in other places ; as our translators rightly render below. Nearly in the same manner, 13 : 19. and elsewhere, *the wicked one.* Whatever is calculated *to seduce men to sin*, is represented by the sacred writers under the figure of *a living agent*, called *the evil one—the adversary—the enemy—the devil, and satan.*"

2d. The devil, a fallen angel, is also supposed to be called "*o peiradzon*, the tempter." This word is rendered to tempt, to try, to prove. The following are all the places where it occurs in the New Testament. James 1 : 13, 14. Gal. 6 : 1. Rev. 2 : 10. Acts 15 : 10. 2 Cor. 13 : 5. 1 Cor. 7 : 5. Heb. 11 : 17. John 6 : 6. 1 Thess. 3 : 5. Acts 5 : 9. Rev. 3 : 10. 1 Cor. 10 : 13. Matth. 22 : 18. Mark 12 : 15. Luke 20 : 23. Heb. 2 : 18. Mark 1 : 13. Luke 4 : 2. Matth. 16 : 1. and 19 : 3. Mark 8 : 11. and 10 : 2. Luke 11 : 16. John 8 : 6. Matth. 4 : 1. and 22 : 35. Heb. 4 : 15. We have given book, chapter and verse, that the reader may consult the passages and see, if in any one of them, the tempter mentioned, refers to such a being. The following are the only places from which such a thing could be supposed.

Matth. 4 : 3. Mark 1 : 13. and Luke 4 : 2, 13. have already been noticed in considering our Lord's temptation and require no further attention. If the devil and satan, do not refer to a fallen angel, the tempter cannot, for it is allowed these terms are used as names for the same thing. In 1 Thess. 3 : 5. it is said "For this cause when I could no longer forbear, I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you and our labor be in vain."

What tempter did the apostle refer to? Answer, we have seen from various passages, that the principle of evil, or sensual desire, is the tempter, and is called the devil and satan. Indeed this is the foundation of all the other senses in which these words are used. This principle, operated in every possible way, in the opposers of Christianity, whom Paul calls satan, chap. 2: 18. noticed, sect. 5. the Thessalonians were called to suffer persecution from them, chap. 3: 3, 4. They were also liable to be influenced by the principle of evil or sensual desire. Anxious for their steadfastness in the faith, the apostle expresses his fear, lest by *some means* the tempter had tempted them, and his labor prove vain. This view is confirmed, from verses 6, 7. where we are informed what relieved the apostle's anxiety of mind. It was not that a fallen angel had not succeeded in tempting them, but merely that their faith and charity continued.

3d. The devil, a fallen angel, is also supposed to be called—“*the dragon*” and “*the great red dragon*,” Rev. chaps. 12. 13. 16. 20. But sufficient has been said on these passages in the last section to which we refer the reader.

4th. The devil, a fallen angel, is also believed, to be called “the serpent,” and “that old serpent.” We have noticed Gen. 3. sufficiently in Section 2. Where the phrase, “that old serpent” occurs, has also been considered, Sect. 7. The only other text relative to this subject, is 2 Cor. 11: 3. “But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity which is in Christ.” See some remarks on this passage Sect. 2. What I would observe further here is—1st. Had Paul believed, as a great many do now, that a fallen angel or wicked

spirit beguiled Eve, would he not have said so? Let any candid man consider, if he would merely say the serpent beguiled her. Is any account given in Scripture of the fall of such an angel from heaven? If there be, we will thank any man to point it out. Paul does not even say, that "*old serpent*," or "*that old serpent the devil and satan*." This is the more remarkable omission, as in this very chapter he speaks of satan being transformed into an angel of light. 2d. We allow, yea, contend, that the serpent is the same as the devil and satan, and are used in Scripture as convertible terms to express the same thing. As to this point, we agree perfectly with our orthodox friends. We only contend, that the devil and satan, is not a fallen angel, or evil being, as they suppose. What then is the tempter, the devil, and satan, of which the Scriptures speak? James says, "every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." This is the real original serpent, devil, or tempter, as has been shown on various texts in the course of our remarks. See Sect. 2. particularly. No man could be tempted, unless he had lusts or desires, any more than a tree or stone. The Saviour was incapable of being tempted without them. 3d. Eve was beguiled by the serpent, or her desire after what was forbidden, and the apostle was in fear concerning the Corinthians, lest by any means their minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. He does not intimate that he was in fear that a fallen angel would do this? No, his fear was, lest *by any means* this might be done, and in the course of the chapter, he points not to a fallen angel as the agent, but to false teachers who preached another gospel to them, and whom, verse 13. he calls "*false apostles*," and "*deceitful workers*." In Sect. 2. it has been shown that the *serpent* is the symbol of deceit.

5th. The devil, a fallen angel, is also supposed to be called the prince of this world (*o' arhon*.) This word occurs in Luke 12: 58. 23: 13. Acts 4: 5. Luke 23: 35. 24: 20. John 7: 20. Acts 3: 17. 4: 8, 26. 13: 27. Rom. 13: 3. Matth. 9: 23. John 7: 48. Acts 14: 5. 7: 27, 35. 16: 19. Acts 23: 5. Matth. 20: 25. 1 Cor. 2: 6, 8. Luke 14: 1. Matth. 9: 18. Luke 8: 41. 18: 18. John 3: 1. 12: 42. The word in the above texts is rendered chief, ruler, magistrate, prince, &c. It is applied to men as rulers, both civil and ecclesiastical, and that whether Jewish or heathen. In the following texts, it is rendered prince, and refers to the prince of the demons, or as it is rendered in our version, devils, Matth. 9: 34. 12: 24. Mark 3: 22. Luke 11: 15. Beelzebub was the prince of the demons. But that this heathen god had no reference to satan or the devil, see Dr. Campbell's 6th Dissertation. In Eph. 2: 2. this word occurs, and is rendered prince, which will be considered presently. The only passages, where it is supposed a reference is had to the devil, are the following, which I shall quote altogether, and then submit some remarks on them for consideration.

John 12: 31. "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince (*o' arhon*) of this world be cast out." And 14: 30. "Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince (*o' arhon*) of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me." And 16: 8—12. "And when he (the comforter) is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me: of righteousness, because I go to my father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince (*o' arhon*) of this world is judged." On these passages, the principal question we have to consider is, who or what did our Lord refer to, by "*the prince of this world?*" Orthodox people say—"the devil, a

fallen angel." But that our Lord by "the prince of this world" meant the then reigning civil and ecclesiastical rulers, I shall now attempt to prove.

1st. This view is in agreement with the general, yea, almost universal usage of the word *arhon* in the New Testament. Let any one turn to all the above texts and he must be convinced of this; for this word is rendered magistrate, ruler, prince, &c. and applied to the rulers, both civil and ecclesiastical, then existing in Judea. It is not once used in reference to a fallen angel unless it is proved from the three texts just quoted.

2d. From the scope and connexion of our Lord's discourse, where he speaks of the prince of this world. The three texts where this is mentioned, all occur in John's gospel, and in discourses of our Lord's only related by John. They were spoken by our Lord to his disciples in reference to, and in view of, his apprehension, sufferings, and death. The context of these passages show this, which the reader is desired to consult. As to the first, consult verses 27—34. and it will be seen, that our Lord was speaking in view of the *hour* of his crucifixion. As to the two last, they occur in that discourse delivered partly in the upper room where he had eaten the last passover, and partly on the road from thence to the garden where he was apprehended. In chap. 14: 30. he says, "the prince of this world cometh," and at verse 31. he adds—"But that the world may know that I love the father; and as the father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence." Go where? let me ask. Evidently to the garden where he was apprehended, as is evident by reading on to chap. 18: 15.

3d. The fact of the case shows, that by "the prince of this world," our Lord referred to the civil and ecclesiastical power, and not to a fallen angel. Let

any one consult all the future history of our Lord's life, from the time he uttered these words, until he died on the cross, but he finds nothing that looks like a fallen angel or devil coming to him. Well, did those powers come to him? Nothing can be more certain. Our Lord had no sooner ended his discourse, in chaps. 14, 15, 16, 17. than we are told chap. 18: 1. "When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a garden, into which he entered, and his disciples." Well, what came to him here? From verse 3. and onward, we are informed, that Jesus was apprehended by the civil authority, urged on by the ecclesiastical. The prince of this world, or as the word is rendered in other places, the ruler or magistrate of this world came. Our Lord no doubt knew all that Judas, the chief priests, and civil authorities were engaged in for his apprehension. Well, he says, chap. 14: 30. "The prince of this world cometh," (*erhatai*.) To testify to the world his love to the father, and obedience to his commandment to lay down his life, he says to his disciples, verse 31. "Arise, let us go hence." He proceeds to the garden, where he knew Judas and the officers were coming to apprehend him. He foresaw their coming, and says, "the prince or ruler of this world cometh," and he goes forth voluntarily to meet the result. Accordingly in chap. 18: 3. it is said, "Judas then having received a band of men, and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh (*erhatai*) thither with lanterns, and torches, and weapons." The chapter throughout shows all that took place afterwards, which the reader would do well to consult.

4th. The above is confirmed from the words which follow. He said "the prince of this world cometh," and immediately adds—"and hath nothing in me." This is generally understood, that the devil, a fallen

angel, had nothing of sin or corruption in the Saviour whereon to work. But this interpretation is perfectly gratuitous, for there is no evidence that this was our Lord's meaning. But, on the view which I have given of the prince of this world, it is consonant to truth, and evidence stated in the context. Thus, when our Lord was taken before Pilate, and he had examined the case, what does Pilate say? His words are remarkable: "I find in him no fault at all," chap. 18 : 38. Very similar to those of our Lord; "The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me," or against me.

5th. My view is also confirmed from the words which immediately precede the expression—"the prince of this world cometh." They stand thus—"Hereafter I will not talk much with you." Why not? Our Lord assigns as a reason for his not talking much with his disciples afterwards—"for the prince of this world cometh." Was the devil, a fallen angel, to prevent his talking with his disciples? This must be affirmed by those who say that he referred to such a being. But how could he prevent him talking with his disciples? Let those explain this who believe it. It is easily perceived how he was prevented, on my views of the prince of this world. The moment he was apprehended in the garden, his disciples forsook him and fled, and from this period, being in the hands of his enemies, he was not at liberty to talk much with his disciples, nor had he much opportunity if even liberty had been allowed him.

6th. The only thing remaining which deserves notice, is the following. "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out." The word here rendered judgment, signifies condemned or condemnation, and is so rendered in other places. Is it asked how the world were condemned? They were so, by their rejecting and cru-

cifying Christ, and is illustrated by such passages as John 3 : 18, 19. Is it asked how the prince or powers of this world were cast out? By putting to death the Lord of glory, the Jews filled up the measure of their iniquity, and from that hour were cast out from being the people of God, and have been so for nearly two thousand years. They were the chief persons concerned in our Lord's crucifixion, for the Roman power was only called in to effect their purpose. Pilate showed how unwilling he was to condemn Jesus contrary to all law and justice.

6th. The devil, a fallen angel, is also supposed to be called "the prince of the power of the air." Eph. 2 : 2. "Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." Wakefield renders the passage thus—"conformably to the ruler of this empire of darkness, the spirit that now showeth its power in the sons of disobedience." "It was the opinion both of the Jews and heathen," says Whitby on this text, "*that the air was full of spirits called demons; that from the earth to the firmament, all things were full of these companies or rulers; and that there was a prince over them who was called the governor of the world, that is, of the darkness of it.*" This agrees to Zoroaster's *angel of darkness*, who was considered the author and director of all evil. The apostle evidently here alludes to this heathen notion, but he told the Ephesians, that this prince or governor of the world, was the spirit which wrought in the children of disobedience. The evil, or wickedness of men's minds, is the true devil, satan, or governor of this world.

7th. The devil is also supposed to be called "the god of this world." 2 Cor. 4 : 4. "In whom the god of this world (*aionos*) hath blinded the minds of

them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." The god of this world mentioned here, is the same as the prince or power of the air in the last, which Whitby says, they called "*the governor of this world*, that is, of the darkness of it." But the apostle declares, that this governor of the world, prince of the power of the air, or god of this world, was the spirit that wrought in the children of disobedience. This view is agreeable to the words before us, for this certainly blinded the minds of them which believed not.

We have now finished our remarks on all the passages which are supposed to contain the names and titles of an evil being in the universe, deemed by most Christians but little inferior in powers to its Creator. We have stated our views frankly, but in some cases very briefly. Such texts on which the greatest dependance is placed for proof, have been considered pretty fully. The result of this investigation has been, a deep conviction, that the more the subject is examined, it will be found that the Bible gives no countenance to that evil being Christians call the devil and satan. But of this our readers must judge for themselves.

SECTION IX.

FACTS STATED, SHOWING THAT THE DEVIL IS NOT A FALLEN
ANGEL OR REAL BEING.

In the preceding Sections several facts have been developed, showing that the devil is not a fallen an-

gel. We shall now very briefly advert to some other facts, not easily reconciled to this doctrine.

1st. *No distinct account is given in Scripture of an angel of God sinning in heaven, thereby becoming a devil, and on account of which he was cast out of it.* When proof is demanded of such things, we are referred to texts where satan or the devil is said to have fallen from heaven, and to be cast out into the earth. But we have shown that the sacred writers attached no such ideas to those passages, and by quotations from Jahn, Newton and others, that a very different thing was intended. How then is the fact accounted for, that no sacred writer gives such an account? Is it too much to expect, that such a remarkable event would be clearly and repeatedly mentioned, yea, recorded previous to the fall of man? If true, would all the sacred writers have been silent about it both before and after the fall? This is contrary to God's usual conduct with men. When God was about to destroy the world by a flood, and the cities of the plain by fire, he forewarns the people of their danger, so as to avoid the consequences. But concerning a holy angel becoming a devil in heaven, his fall from it, and the direful consequences to our race, God says nothing about such things. The want of such information is indisputable, and we think no man will affirm, that this is either like God's usual dealings with men, or that he assigns any reason for withholding such information. How then do our orthodox friends account for all this, and where did they obtain such explicit information as they generally give to people about a fallen angel, and the consequences of his fall upon the human race? Was it from Paradise Lost and the Apocrypha, or was it from the Scriptures? We beg of them to re-examine this subject.

2d. *If it be true that an angel fell from heaven, and has been walking about in the world seeking whom he might*

devour, for nearly six thousand years, how is it to be accounted for, that no sacred writer asserts that any person ever saw him, or had personal intercourse with him? They repeatedly inform us of persons seeing good angels, and relate the conversations which men had with them. They even inform us of their appearance, and sometimes describe the clothing they had on. But do they ever intimate that any one ever saw the devil, describe his appearance and clothing, or relate any conversations held with him? It cannot be for want of powers on his part to do all this, for our brethren believe that he can do more remarkable things than any of these. Is he ashamed to show himself among men? We doubt this, for he is believed to be a shameless being. Well, does he conceal himself from men, that he may the more effectually accomplish his wicked designs against them? We doubt this also, for it is affirmed by his advocates, that he can assume a very fascinating form, yea, transform himself into an angel of light, the more effectually to deceive us. How then do our orthodox brethren account for it, that no sacred writer says any one ever saw the devil, or conversed with him? We are aware, that they may object by saying "did he not assume the likeness of a serpent in Eden, and did he not converse with Eve?" But brethren, you take this for granted, which is the very question you ought to prove. Besides, we have shown, Section 2. that this is a mistaken view of Gen. 3. You will perhaps object again by saying, "did not satan make a personal appearance among the sons of God as stated in the first and second chapters of Job, and is not his conversation distinctly related?" We answer yes; but can you disprove the evidence which has been adduced, that satan was not a real being, but only the evil imaginary god of the Magians? If you can, we shall feel greatly indebted to you if you take

the trouble to do this. But perhaps you will object again by saying, "did not the devil appear to the Saviour and hold a conversation with him?" Answer; did you ever notice, that neither in the two first chapters of Job, nor in the account of our Lord's temptation, nothing is said about any form, color, or shape, which satan assumed? Nor in either of these cases, are the conversations represented as held by him with sinful men. Besides, in considering those accounts, we think it has been shown that no such being was intended by the writers. If you can prove the contrary, we hope it will be done. Do you object further by saying, "are we not told that satan transformed himself into an angel of light, and is he not represented in the book of Revelations under the form of a great red dragon?" Yes; and you might add "having seven heads, and ten horns, and crowns on his heads; yea, as having a pretty long tail, which could sweep from the firmament a third part of the stars and cast them to the earth." But brethren, is it correct to assume as true, that the devil is a fallen angel, and then recur to the symbolical language of Scripture for proof, which proofs, when adduced, render your doctrine ridiculous? Besides, have we not shown that such passages have no relation to such a subject? Is it still objected "does not the history of the world since revelation was completed, furnish accounts of the devil appearing to men in various forms, conversing with them; of persons who have sold themselves soul and body to him, and at the agreed time he has come and carried them away wholesale from the world?" Yes; verily such stories have been told. But if any minister among us should preach such nonsense to the people, he might be looking out for another parish in some other quarter of the globe. If any man among us should seriously say he had seen the devil, and conversed with him, his friends

would soon procure a place for him in the insane hospital. Do our orthodox friends believe such childish stories themselves? They would smile at me if I even suggested that they had any faith in them; still however, they continue to preach that an angel fell from heaven, has ruined the whole human race, deceives them, walks about seeking whom he may devour, and that he will be the eternal tormentor of a considerable portion of them. Yet no person has ever seen him or conversed with him, nor do the Scriptures teach his existence, when carefully and candidly examined.

3d. *If an angel fell from heaven before the sin of our first parents, how do our orthodox brethren account for the fact, that the Jews, to whom were committed the oracles of God, were obliged to go to Babylon to get information about such a being?* Moses says nothing about him; nor delivers any injunctions to Israel concerning him. Nor until after the Babylonish captivity does it appear that such a being was known in Judea, except as an evil god among the heathen nations. We would ask our brethren, affectionately, how they account for this, if their views of the devil are drawn from divine revelation? The Old Testament writers use the term *satan*, but never use it to designate an angel who fell from heaven. They had the name, but wanted the evil being to whom they could apply it.

4th. *It is a notorious fact, not easily accounted for on Scripture ground, that people in these days make very different uses of the terms devil and satan from what were made in the days of the inspired writers.* I shall give an example or two of what I mean. First, you never find in those days, as in these, persons apologising for crimes by blaming the devil. Nor do you find that any one ever made the devil a bugbear for the purpose of frightening their children into obedience. Nor does the devil appear to have been any object

of fear, to old or young, by night or by day. Besides, though men in ancient times, as in these, were given to cursing and swearing, yet you do not find that any of them had learned to swear by the devil. An instance is not on record, of one in a passion or otherwise, who ever wished any of his fellow creatures to go to hell or the devil. In old times, people swore by the name of the Lord, and cursed each other by their gods, but no one seems to have known how to swear by satan or the devil. And it is equally certain, that no inspired writer seems to have known how to give such horrible descriptions of the devil and hell torments, as is frequently done by modern preachers. But it is well known, that many damn their hearers to endless hell torments, and send them without much ceremony to the devil; and is it any matter of surprise, that their hearers in a less genteel way should do the same? So long as we have so much unscriptural, not to say profane talk about the devil and hell torments in the pulpit, let us cease to wonder, that similar profane, silly language should salute our ears in the streets almost at every corner.

5th. *The Old Testament is often quoted in the New, and quoted to show what was the faith of believers during that dispensation, but is never quoted nor alluded to, showing that any of them believed the devil to be a fallen angel.* They neither announce this as an Old Testament doctrine, nor as a new revelation from God under the gospel dispensation. Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness, but it is not said of any one that he believed in a fallen angel, called the devil; and that this was of use to him in any way. We have seen, that both Old and New Testament writers frequently speak of satan and the devil, and we appeal to the candor of our brethren to say, whether the Scripture writers would have applied these terms to good and bad men, to the

angel of Jehovah, to men's evil passions and to a piece of writing, had they considered them appropriate titles of the worst being in the universe, and the implacable enemy of God and man?

6th. *It is a fact that, in every country where the Bible is not known, or not studied where it is known, there superstitious notions have prevailed concerning witches, evil spirits, ghosts and the devil: and just in proportion as it has been known and studied all such superstitions have gradually been exploded and renounced by the people.* For example, not many centuries ago, it was firmly believed by all the Christian world, that human beings could become witches and wizards. It was also believed, that they were in league with the devil, and could perform very extraordinary things. See Mather's *Magnalia*. When the tragical scenes of the Salem witchcraft were acting, the man who would have written against it, as I now do against the devil, would have been an object of universal execration. But I doubt if you can find in the town of Salem an intelligent man who has the least faith in the doctrine of witchcraft. Even the devil himself now, with all his extraordinary powers, does not excite one half the attention which a few witches did in those days. Let him muster all the priestcraft and superstition left in the land to his assistance, he could not procure a jury of twelve men to condemn a single individual to death for being in league with him. It was a dark day for the devil when witchcraft declined, for from that hour his popularity has been on the wane, it being one of his chief supports. All their powers were derived from him. Now, it is believed they never had any, and people are as much puzzled to explain how a human being could become a witch or a wizard, as how a holy angel in heaven could become a devil. But while people are generally agreed that witchcraft was all a piece of superstition

and do justice to the devil in freeing him from all blame about it, yet they still continue to believe in his existence and extraordinary powers. We look back with surprise to the days when our fathers burned the witches, and throw the mantle of charity over them. Our children will have to do the same for us a century hence. Will they not have to say—“Strange that our fathers should say the power of witches was all a piece of superstition yet not see that the power of the devil was no better. Strange that they should perceive all the proofs of witchcraft were mistaken views of the Bible, and yet think their proofs of a personal devil correct: strange, that they should discard witches as imaginary beings yet believe their father the devil to be a real being. Their devil never performed such wonders as witches have done. Did their devil ever bring a good man from the state of the dead to converse with the living as did the witch of Endor? Strange, beyond measure strange, that our fathers should so completely discard witchcraft as a superstition which the Jews imbibed from the Canaanites, where no devil was known, and yet continue to believe in the devil, a superstition which the Jews imbibed at Babylon many ages after.” Thus will our children be surprised at our superstition and weakness and will have to cover us with the mantle of their charity for our belief in the personality of the devil as we do that of our fathers respecting witches.

That a great revolution of opinion has taken place about witches, ghosts, &c. no one can well deny. Well, how has it been effected? Not by force, but by the slow, gradual influence of the light of truth. The Bible has been more read and critically examined. Reason and common sense, formerly degraded, assume their proper place and dignity. The arts and sciences have been cultivated and the means of hu-

man knowledge greatly increased. Witchcraft, like the owl of the night, has fled before all this light, and no place is found for it in this country. So will it be, and so let it be, until every superstition is banished from the earth.

7th. *It is also a fact, that the common opinions entertained of the devil, are at variance with other plain and acknowledged truths of the Bible.* I shall only give an example or two of this. The devil is generally accused of tempting men to sin. But when the Scriptures speak in plain language, they inform us that men tempt each other to sin, Prov. 1 : 10. And that every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed, James 1 : 14. and 4 : 1—4. In the popular language of the times, Judas' crimes are ascribed to the devil. But they are also ascribed to himself, Acts 1 : 18—26. Judas takes all the blame to himself—"I have betrayed the innocent blood." By consulting the following texts it may be seen, that things are sometimes ascribed to the devil, to God, and to men. Luke 22 : 3. John 13 : 2, 27, 30. Acts 2 : 23. 2 Sam. 14 : 1. 1 Chron. 21 : 1. 1 Kings 22 : 22, 23. James 1 : 13, 14. Jer. 4 : 10. Ezek. 14 : 9. Comp. 2 Thess. 2 : 8—12. 1 John 3 : 8. Gen. 45 : 6—8. 42 : 21, 22. Acts 5 : 3. and 4 : 9. It is generally asserted, that the devil is the secret agent in tempting men, and that he makes tools of them ; but this is taken for granted as true, which ought to be proved true, for the Scriptures no where assert this.

8th. *It is also a fact, that men in sinning, are never conscious of the influence of the devil over them.* They have learned to say, that the devil influences men to sin, and sometimes blame the devil for their crimes, but the personal consciousness and experience of every man declares, that no such influence was felt, nor was it needed. An evil influence is felt, but it is the influence of our own lusts and passions, *drawing us*

away and enticing us. The Scripture devil does tempt us, but not a fallen angel as is commonly believed.

9th. *It is also a fact, that the common opinions entertained of the devil, whether right or wrong, are the effect of early education and popular opinion.* With most people, reason, common sense, and the Bible, had nothing to do in forming such opinions, but have been implicitly received by tradition from their fathers. They say they believe them, but cannot tell why, except that they were so taught, for they have never exercised their reason or studied the Bible to see whether they are true or false. Even when a person determines to examine such opinions, his early prejudices within, and popular opinion without, overawe and deter him from giving free scope to his investigations. We speak here from experience, for these have been powerfully felt in the course of this discussion.

10th. *The last fact which I shall mention is, that allowing the personal existence of the devil fully proved, it is beyond all doubt, that he has been much misrepresented, and his character abused by many Christian people.* I shall only give an instance or two. For many ages he was accused of making witches and wizards. Now it is allowed no such beings ever existed but the whole was a piece of superstition and an astonishing instance of human credulity. Again, for ages, and even now, what frightful descriptions have been given of the devil, in preaching. He has been accused, as being the tormentor of damned souls in hell, and imagination has been put to the utmost stretch, to describe his horrible modes of torture there. Now, not a word of this is true, for let the devil have his due, no scripture writer ever says a word about the devil as the tormentor of any one. In fact many a railing, not to say wicked accusation has been brought against the devil, and though this is now allowed true,

no apology is made for such shameful, unscriptural defamation. We readily excuse all this, for though preachers have declaimed against such a being in the pulpit, and terrified people with such horrible descriptions of him, all must have seen that they had no great faith in their own doctrine. They, like other people, live all the six days of the week without any fear or concern about him. The minister makes him a bugbear in the pulpit to frighten the parents, and parents at home make the same use of him to frighten their children, but both take care not to be too much frightened themselves.

SECTION X.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

ANY objections which have occurred to me against the views advanced, I shall fairly state and attempt to answer. It may then be objected

1st. "The devil, satan, or tempter, is spoken of as a real being. Personal pronouns, are not only used in speaking of him, but he is represented as speaking and acting, and we are expressly informed of what he said and did."—This objection has been partially adverted to in the course of our remarks, but I shall here notice it a little further. If all to which personal pronouns are applied, are to be considered real beings, we must admit many inanimate things, yea, qualities to be real beings as well as the devil. For example, the earth or land is personified, Job 31 : 38. The heavens are also personified, Jer. 2 : 12, 13. So is the sea, Job 38 : 8, 9. Death, the grave, and destruction are personified, Job 28 : 22. 1 Cor. 15 : 55.

The host of heaven are personified, Psalm 148 : 1—5. See the whole Psalm. The mountains and hills can sing, and all the trees of the field can clap their hands, Isai. 55 : 12. Wisdom, power, and a variety of good qualities, are personified in Scripture, and why not also bad qualities, yea, the principle of evil itself? In short, if things represented as speaking and acting, must be considered as real beings, and proofs of personal existence, then it is certain all inanimate creation ought to be considered real beings, for almost all things are represented as living, and speaking, and acting. Jotham's olive tree, fig-tree, vine and bramble, must be considered living beings, for they are represented as holding a conversation together. Judg. 9 : 7—16. Micaiah's speech to Ahab, 1 Kings 22. must also be literally understood, and who does not perceive, what absurdities would ensue, if such a mode of interpretation was adopted.

2d. "If there be no foundation in Scripture for a fallen angel, called the devil, how came this opinion to obtain such universal currency among mankind? The opinion, you say, was held by the Magians, and this evil being was considered their evil god, and called *ahraman*, and by the Greeks *arimanius*. Zoroaster called him "an angel of darkness," and other nations have had various other names for him. Now, as all counterfeit money implies current, must there not be a foundation in truth for such a universal belief of an evil being, call him devil, satan, or by any other name?"—As this is the principal, and most popular objection, which can be advanced against my views, I shall spend some time in considering it. It is true that counterfeit money implies current, but do our orthodox friends believe, that counterfeit opinions in religion, always imply that there is some foundation in Scripture for them. If there be, they could not be altogether false. Do they allow, that there is

some foundation in truth for a purgatory and the doctrine of transubstantiation? Do they believe, that there is any foundation in truth for witchcraft, for ghosts, and all the different grades of hobgoblins? Will they allow that there is a foundation in Scripture for all the wild and ridiculous opinions which have obtained currency in the world? If not, why assert that there must be for the common opinion concerning the devil? Is it not possible to invent a thousand things which have no foundation in the Bible? Error supposes truth, as counterfeit money supposes current, but is it true that every error is a corruption of truth? But it ought to be noticed, that Dean Prideaux did not consider the articles of Zoroaster's creed, quoted Sect. 4. as corruptions of truth, but consonant to the truth. Nor do Christians in our day, for they have adopted both the sentiments and language of his creed. Why then call them corruptions of the truth? If they are, why preach such corruptions for truth to the world? Do orthodox preachers tell the people, that such sentiments are greatly corrupted, both as to matter and language? On the contrary, do they not solemnly assure their hearers, that such doctrines are the faithful sayings of God, though it is notorious Zoroaster taught them six hundred years before the days of Christ. Will they thank me for suggesting that there is any corruption in the case? If they believe such opinions have any corruption about them, why not purge them, and preach only the unadulterated truth of God? Why pass as current Bible doctrine, such counterfeit opinions on the public? Although there is no law to punish men for passing counterfeit opinions in religion, yet one should think, their own doctrine of eternal misery if they believed it, would be sufficient to deter them.

If the universal belief in a devil, proves that there is a foundation in truth for the opinion, then Pagan-

ism, Mahometanism, and Roman Catholicism, have all a foundation in truth, for they have all in their turn been pretty universally believed. Purgatory, transubstantiation, witchcraft, and a thousand other opinions, ought not to be discarded, for they were once generally believed. Many good and learned men also believed them, and thought their proofs for them as good as those now adduced concerning the devil. Why are they rejected? Because, close attention to the Bible has shown they are not taught there, and closer attention will show also, that the common opinions concerning the devil are equally false. But if the above objection had any real force, or the reasoning employed be correct, our orthodox friends will allow, that universal salvation, and that there is no devil, are opinions, which may have some foundation in the Scriptures, and that should they ever come to be universally believed, this universal reception would make them true. But will they admit such reasoning as correct?

How such an opinion, as that concerning an evil being called the devil, came first to exist among men, has been partly accounted for in Sections 3. and 4. Christians learned this opinion from the Jews, the Jews learned it from Zoroaster's creed, and Zoroaster learned it from the ancient Magian religion. Well, it may be asked, how came the Magians to imbibesuch an opinion? I would first answer this question by asking another. How came the Sabians to worship idols? Was there any foundation in Scripture for this? But, the apostle in Rom. 1. answers the question, how all such deviations from truth originated. Men when they knew God glorified him not as God, they became vain in their imaginations, their foolish heart was darkened; and professing themselves to be wise they became fools. See verses 21, 22, 23. *Respecting the origin of an evil principle,*

which was afterwards personified and deified, Essenus thus writes p. 125. "Plutarch observes, that the doctrine of two contrary principles prevailed in all countries. The reason is obvious; evil abounded in every age and nation: and as men could not reconcile the notion of natural and moral evil with an all-wise and benevolent author, it was natural for them to reason in the following manner: 'Since nothing can come into being without a cause; and since that which is perfectly good cannot be the cause of evil, then there must exist a distinct principle in nature, as well for the production of evil as of that which is good.' In this manner argued the Persian sages; and Plutarch seems to have considered the argument conclusive. This doctrine was introduced into Judea before the age of Isaiah, who, as we have seen, thus sets it aside: 'I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil: I the Lord do all these things.' 45: 7."

3d. It may also be objected, "you have said, that the doctrine of an evil principle deified, was known as early as the days of Job, which was about the time of Moses: but is not this too early a date for the existence of such an opinion among men, and is there any proof that it existed at such a date?" Some notice was taken of this objection, Section 3. and I shall here add a few remarks in reply to it. It is then certain, that the worship of idols prevailed in the world before the days of Moses. If the question is examined, did the worship of idols or that of an evil principle first prevail? we think the evidence will be in favor of the latter. But, we have found it impossible to ascertain dates as to the first origin of either, both being lost in antiquity, where no dates are given. Essenus quoting from Plutarch, says p. 74. "'There are others again, who call the good principle only God, giving the name of Demon to the evil being; in

which number is Zoroaster the Magian, who is said to have lived 5000 years before the Trojan war. Now, this philosopher calls the good principle Oromazes, and the evil one Arimanius; adding, moreover, that as of all sensible beings, the former bears the greatest resemblance to light, so the latter was most like darkness.' § 45, 40. The doctrine here stated is undoubtedly very ancient; but the earliness of the period in which Zoroaster is said to have lived is absurd and must have proceeded from that propensity in which all nations indulged to magnify their own antiquity." Further; Mr. Mayo, in his *Ancient Geography*, says, p. 37. "the Scythians, whom the dawn of history discovers in present Persia under their king Tanus, attack Vexores king of Egypt, conquer Asia, and establish the Scythian empire fifteen hundred years before Ninus, or three thousand six hundred and sixty years before Christ." And quoting from Mr. Pinkerton concerning "the aboriginal Scythian empire of Persia," he thus writes: p. 23. "And beyond this there is no memorial of human affairs, save in Egypt alone, the history of which begins with *Menes*, the first king, about four thousand years before our era; while the earliest appearance of the *Scythians* in history is about four hundred years after, when Vexores was king of Egypt, and Tanus of the Scythæ—not to mention the collateral light derived from the whole history of the Greeks and Romans, who were Scythæ, as just shown." He adds, on the same page—"on this route we shall find the *Scythians*, *Getae*, or *Goths*, not only peopling all *Scandnavia* and *Germany*, but extending hence and actually possessing Gaul and Spain five hundred years before Christ, as well as Britain and Ireland three hundred years before Christ." From these statements the following things are obvious:

- 1st. That the Magian religion is very ancient, ex-

tending so far back into antiquity that no distinct account of its origin is to be found on record. If such a thing is in existence we have been unable to find it. 2d. That the people to whom the Christian religion was first preached, from the very nature of the case, must have been previously imbued with the tenets of the Magian religion. It was preached first to the Jews, who had spent seventy years in captivity at Babylon, where we have seen that the Magian religion prevailed. It was also preached by the apostles to the Greeks and Romans, whom Mr. Mayo says, "were Scythians," and "whom the dawn of history discovers in present Persia," the very place where Prideaux, above quoted, says the Magian religion first originated. 3d. Mr. Mayo's statements also show us how the tenets of the Magian religion were diffused throughout Europe. He says, "the Scythians whom the dawn of history discovers in present Persia" we shall find "not only peopling all *Scandenvia* and *Germany*, but extending hence and actually possessing Gaul and Spain five hundred years before Christ, as well as Britain and Ireland three hundred years before Christ." The Magian religion being the ancient religion of Persia, when the people from thence overran *Scandenvia*, *Germany*, Gaul, Spain, Britain and Ireland several hundred years before Christ, they must have carried its principles along with them. A miracle was necessary to prevent Christianity being blended with them when introduced into those countries. That it has been blended with them we think proved in preceding Sections.

We have then all the evidence which the nature of the case will admit, that the doctrine of an evil principle deified, was known among men in the days of Job. If our orthodox brethren deny this, and can prove that their devil had another or better origin, we respectfully request them to prove it.

Such are the chief objections, which are likely to be made against my views of the devil, excepting such as might be made against any innovation in religious popular opinions. But as these have been stated and answered in my Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c. to it I refer the reader. In concluding this Section I would merely remark, that many have good reason to object against my views, for if they are true, what a great loss they must sustain in being robbed of their principal topics of preaching and religious conversation. The devil and eternal hell torments are themes on which many delight to dwell. They seem health to their navel and marrow to their bones, and to remove these would be taking away their gods, and what have they more?



SECTION XI.

CONCLUDING REMARKS, POINTING OUT THE EVILS WHICH
HAVE ARISEN FROM THE COMMON OPINIONS ENTERTAINED
OF THE DEVIL AND SATAN.

It would be an endless task, to detail all the evils which have resulted from the common opinions entertained of the devil. A few only I shall name, and leave the reader to pursue the subject. If it then be true, as I have attempted to show, that no such being as the devil exists, let the reader consider

1st. What a vast number of passages in God's word have been perverted in proof of this doctrine. They are almost innumerable. The texts which have been under our review in this investigation, are but a few of them, for many more, it is well known, are dragged in

as collateral proof of it. Is there no evil then in misunderstanding and perverting God's word? No man will say so, who loves it, and trembles at it. It is one of the greatest of all evils, for it has been the fruitful source of most evils which have existed in the world. If this doctrine be false what a great change it produces on the whole face of the Bible.

2d. Let the reader consider the evil effects of this doctrine on mankind. A belief in the common opinions concerning the devil has laid the foundation for almost every other superstition among Christians. Take into view also, what unnecessary and distressing fears the belief of such opinions have given to children, and even persons of riper years. And who can tell the distress which they have given people, when closing their mortal career. On weak minds, their influence has been such as to drive some to madness, and others to suicide. Most people would dismiss a domestic, if found frightening their children with ghosts and hobgoblins: but these same people, cheerfully pay a man to frighten both them and their children, one day in the week, with the devil. The devil, with many people, is much more feared than God. But what an excellent apology have such opinions afforded men for their sins. The devil has been obliged to bear the blame, while men have had all the pleasure of sinning. By such opinions, men's attention has been turned away from the true devil within them, to an invisible, imaginary being, called the devil, without them. While a deceived heart has been drawing them aside from truth and holiness, the doctrine of the devil helps to calm their fears, stupifies their conscience, and emboldens them to repeat their crimes. And why should it not, if it be true, that such a powerful, deceitful being as the devil, is continually influencing them to sin?

3d. The common opinions concerning the devil,

are highly dishonorable to the character of God. We have never seen the least attempt made to show how such a being as the devil was for the honor of God's character. On the contrary it is believed, that sin dishonors God, and why not also the devil, the author of sin? And why should these be for his dishonor here, when God is finally to make them redound to his glory in the world to come? But if any man can explain, how the devil can be for the honor of God, either here or hereafter, we should be glad to see it done. How such a being, with such extraordinary powers, with this world for his range of wickedness, and existing forever the enemy of God and the tormentor of men, can be for the honor of Jehovah's character, is beyond all my feeble powers to comprehend. It seems to argue, that God could not, or would not prevent his existence. That he cannot, or will not curtail his powers, confine him, restore him, or strike him out of existence. This evil, once introduced, is without remedy and without end. It is certainly a poor account of God to tell us, that the glory and honor of his character, is inseparable from the devil and sin, and that the eternal misery of this being with multitudes of mankind, are to promote the glory of God forever. If this be glory and honor, pray what is dishonor or disgrace?

4th. The common opinions concerning the devil and satan, with others generally held, have tended to land men in downright infidelity. Is it any matter of surprise that men become infidels, when such opinions are presented to them as the religion of Jesus Christ? Is it not rather matter of wonder that all men are not infidels? Cast your eyes round the whole world, and say, if infidelity has not had its hot-bed, in the countries where such absurd and ridiculous opinions have been palmed on the world for religion by interested priests. Neither infidelity, nor

idolatry, can be conquered or prevented, but by the truth of God.

5th. Such opinions, mixed with the religion of Jesus Christ, have been in time past, and must be while they are retained, a great hindrance to the universal reception of Christianity in the world. It is a question of no ordinary kind to a reflecting mind, Is the religion of Jesus Christ presented to the heathen in its pure unadulterated state? Or, are we introducing to them a human creed, containing articles derived from Zoroaster and the Grecian philosophy, and only supplanting one system of ignorance, superstition, and cruelty, by establishing another in some respects worse? Viewing the creeds taught the heathen generally, let us see if this is saying any thing but the truth. Christian missionaries teach only one God, but this God they divide into three. But passing this, I ask, what heathen god ever called on its votaries to believe that he had *elected* some to everlasting happiness before they were born, and had *left*, not to say *doomed* all the rest to endless misery? Heathen gods have required parents to sacrifice their children to them, women to immolate themselves on the funeral piles of their husbands, and hecatombs of old and young have been slaughtered to appease their wrath; but name the heathen god, if you can, that ever required its worshippers to be willing to be damned in order that he might save them? What heathen divinity ever required its votaries to believe, that hell was paved with the skulls of their infants a span long? And, when did any of them ever teach their worshippers, that their happiness in heaven will be greatly increased by the sight of their nearest and dearest relatives writhing under eternal torments? I call on our orthodox brethren to name the heathen god, who ever taught such doctrines, or ever bore such a cruel, horrible character; and to crown the climax of his

nameless wickedness said, "*all this was done for the display of his glorious character.*" Who would be a Christian if this be the Christian's God? Who would not be a Pagan to get rid of such a God?

Is it said—"Missionaries do not teach such things to the heathen?" It will certainly afford me pleasure to find that they do not. But did they not teach such things here, before they went far hence unto the Gentiles to teach them? If they taught them here, why not there? Had they openly avowed their disbelief in such doctrines here, would they ever have been employed as missionaries? The managers of missions teach such doctrines. They hold the purse strings; and would not the pay of a missionary be stopped, and himself degraded from his office, if he openly avowed his disbelief in such doctrines? If it was reported to the managers at home, that any missionary taught such doctrines to the heathen, would he be admonished or dismissed the service? Would he not be rather applauded for his faithfulness and zeal, in propagating the pure, and distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel? Presuming, then, that such doctrines are taught to the heathen, permit me to ask, what an intelligent heathen might be expected to say to such Missionaries? He might surely with great propriety say something like the following:—"Gentlemen missionaries—You have been at some trouble, and considerable expense in coming here to teach us about your God and religion. While we thank you for your good intentions, we must say that we cannot change our own gods for yours, or add one more to the gods we have already, unless he is a good, kind, and merciful God. Our own gods are cruel enough, but if your God be as you describe him, to receive him as our God, would only be to add to our miserable condition. We have had all the tender feelings of our hearts torn to pieces, in seeing our infants and

relations tortured to death to satisfy our present gods. But bad as they are, none of them ever made such cruel demands on us as yours do on you. No, none of them ever demanded us to believe, that our eternal felicity would be increased, by beholding others in misery, and that we ourselves must be willing to be damned for their glory or we never could be saved by them.. You have come a great way to tell us that all our gods are but dumb idols. Perhaps this may be true; but unless you suppose us heathen devoid of all feeling and common sense, how could you ever suppose, that we would renounce our earthly cruel false gods for an eternally cruel true one. Return to your employers, with our thanks for their good intentions towards us, and when we send Missionaries to your country, they shall bring you thousands of gods all better than the one you propose to us. Bad as our gods are, none of them like yours, allows a devil to ruin us here, and torment us forever in the world to come. Our fathers knew about your devil, and you have borrowed a considerable part of your creed from what they were taught many years before your religion existed, and yet you come to tell us things which we knew long before, as wonderful revelations from your God. Whether your impudence is not as great as you think our ignorance to be, you may reflect about, on your passage home. Fare you well."

To conclude. If we wish the heathen to cast their idols to the moles and to the bats, let us cast our devil and many other idol opinions out of the Christian religion, and let us both say, what have we any more to do with idols or with the devil? the Lord he is our God and we will serve him.

PART II.

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE EXTENT OF DURATION EXPRESSED BY THE
TERMS OLIM, AION, AND AIONION, RENDERED EVER-
LASTING, FOREVER, &c. IN THE COMMON VERSION,
ESPECIALLY WHEN APPLIED TO PUNISHMENT.

SECTION I.

ALL THE TEXTS NOTICED WHERE OLIM OCCURS IN THE OLD
TESTAMENT, BUT IS RENDERED BY WORDS WHICH DO NOT
EXPRESS OR IMPLY ETERNAL DURATION.

TAYLOR, in his Hebrew concordance, on the word *olim*, says, "The word is applied to time, and signifieth a duration which is concealed, as being of an unknown or great length, with respect either to time past or to come." After quoting some texts, which he supposed proof this, he adds; "it signifies *eternity*, not from the proper force of the word, but when the sense of the place, or the nature of the subject to which it is applied requireth it; as God and his attributes." As he refers to no text to show, that when applied to punishment it signifies eternity, it may I think be inferred, that he did not think it was ever so applied. Parkhurst, on the word *olim*, says, "it

seems to be much more frequently used for an indefinite than for infinite time." And in his Greek Lexicon, on the words *aion* and *aionios*, he says, that the Hebrew word *olim* answers as the corresponding word for these two words in the Greek of the Seventy, "which words denote time hidden from man, whether indefinite or definite, whether past or future." Professor Stuart, in his letters to Dr. Miller p. 128. commenting on Mic. 5 : 1. says: "the words *kedesh* and *od*, rendered by Turretine, *eternity*, are like the Greek *aion*, that also signifies any thing ancient, which has endured or is to endure for a long period. The question when these words are to have the sense of *ancient* or *very old*, is always to be determined by the nature of the case, *i. e.* by the context."

Concessions, such as these, from critics on the language of Scripture, ought to lead every man to examine, if these terms are ever used in the Bible to express the endless duration of punishment. Mr. Stuart's rule, if applied with attention to the general usage of these terms, would soon cool the zeal of many people, who seem to dwell with peculiar delight on the endless duration of punishment to their fellow creatures. It is evident, that the translators of the common version were fully aware, that *olim* was often used by the sacred writers to express a limited period of time, for 1st. They render it *continuance*, Isai. 64 : 5.

2d. *ancient*, and apply it to *landmarks*, Prov. 22 : 28. To *people*, Isai. 44 : 7. To *paths*, Jer. 18 : 15. To *high places*, Ezek. 36 : 2. To *nations*, Jer. 5 : 15. To *times*, Psalm 77 : 5. which is explained to mean *old*. Had *olim* in these texts been rendered eternal, or everlasting, as in some other places, the impropriety would be very manifest. We would then have had an eternal landmark, an everlasting people, eternal paths, and everlasting high places; yea, an everlast-

ing nation, and eternal times. But they had no idea that this word always expressed endless duration, and accordingly rendered it *ancient* as the context of the passages demanded. In the last text they have rendered *olim* both by the word *old* and *ancient*, which if rendered eternal or everlasting, the passages would read thus: "I have considered the days of everlasting, the years of eternal times."

3d. *Olim* is rendered *old* and is equivalent to ancient, as in the last class of passages. Thus the "days of old" is explained to mean "the years of many generations," Deut. 32: 7. Isai. 63: 9. comp. verse 11. which shows that the days of old refer to the days of Moses, Jer. 6: 16. Lam. 3: 6. Amos 9: 11. Mic. 7: 14. Mal. 3: 4. In this last text "days of old" is explained to be "former years," and in the margin our translators have put "ancient years." See also Job 22: 15. Prov. 23: 10. Isai. 58: 12, where we read of the "old way" the "old landmark" and "the old waste places." The explanation given in this last text is "thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations." The same is repeated, chap. 61: 4. In the following texts *olim* is rendered *old* and is applied to a variety of things, which it would only be a waste of time to particularize. Ezek. 25: 15. Jer. 28: 8. Gen. 6: 4. 1 Sam. 27: 8. Psalm 119: 52. Isai. 46: 9. Comp. verse 10. Ezek. 26: 20. Josh. 24: 2. Jer. 2: 20. Psalm 25: 6. Isai. 57: 11. and 51: 9. "ancient days" and "generations of old" are used as explanatory of each other. Eccles. 1: 10. Such are all the texts in which *olim* is rendered old, and on which we shall submit a few brief remarks. Let it be then supposed for a moment, that it had been rendered everlasting, or by any other word which has the idea of endless duration affixed to it, what would follow? It may be observed as an example, that men are called on to remember the days of

everlasting, that God carried Israel all the days of everlasting, and that some are spoken of as dead from everlasting. Besides; the everlasting waste places were to be built, and the giants were from everlasting, men of renown. Whoever chooses to go over all the above texts will see, that to translate *olim* everlasting or eternal, would involve the inspired writers in the grossest absurdities. It is evident, that in all these texts, as in the preceding, *olim* rendered old, signifies ancient. Though it expresses a long, indefinite period of time, yet it would not be a very difficult task to ascertain, in some instances at least, how many years were meant. If *olim* then, in any text rendered everlasting or eternal, does convey the sense of endless duration, it is obvious that it cannot have this meaning in any of the texts which have yet been brought to view. Both the texts and their contexts forbid this, and we have seen, that an explanation is given of this word by the sacred writers to prevent all misapprehension on the subject.

4th. In the following places *olim* is rendered *any*, and *long*, or *any time*, *long time*, *long home*, and *long dead*. Levit. 25 : 32. Isai. 42 : 14. Eccles. 12 : 5. Psalm 143 : 3. To understand *olim* as meaning everlasting in these texts, would make the inspired writers to say, that some have been eternally dead, that the grave is man's everlasting home, and that God has eternally held his peace.

5th. In the following texts *olim* is rendered *world*. Psalm 73 : 12. Eccles. 3 : 11. Isai. 64 : 4. The language used, John 9 : 32. seems to be taken from this last text, and in both, the meaning seems to be since the *age* began, probably referring to the Mosaic age or dispensation. In Isai. 45 : 17. it is said, "Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation: ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded, world without end." Taylor, in his Hebrew Con-

cordance, says it signifies "the ages of perpetuity." I would merely suggest it for consideration, if the phrase "world without end," does not refer to the age or dispensation of the Messiah, which age was not to be succeeded by any other, and corresponds to passages in the New Testament where it is said to be *everlasting*, and to endure *forever*. Whatever may be in this, we think it is evident that *olim* rendered world, in these texts, does not mean endless duration. How does it sound to say, that God sets eternity in the hearts of men, and that the ungodly prosper in the eternity! *Olim* rendered world in these texts, seems to be used in a similar sense as *aion* and *aionion* translated world, in the New Testament. Age, in both, would be a better rendering, for surely neither the material world nor eternity can be referred to.

6th. In Jer. 49: 36. *olim* is translated "*outcasts*." Why it is so I cannot conceive. As it cannot affect the subject under consideration it would not be of much use to spend time in inquiring.

7th. In Deut. 33: 15. the word *olim* is rendered "lasting." By quoting the whole verse it will be seen, that *lasting hills* in the last part, is just another expression for *ancient mountains* in the first, "and for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills." It will be seen presently, that *olim* here translated *ancient* and *lasting*, and applied to the mountains and hills, might just as well have been translated *everlasting*, as it is in Gen. 49: 26. and Hab. 3: 6. and applied to the same things. But I forbear further remarks until we come to those passages.

8th. I find that *olim* is rendered *always*, and *always*, Jer. 20: 17. Gen. 6: 3. 1 Chron. 16: 15. Job 7: 16. Psalm 119: 112. In this last text David ex-

plains always by adding “even unto the end.” But everlasting or eternity has no end.

9th. Sometimes *olim* is rendered *any more*. Ezek. 27 : 36. and 28 : 19. The prophet is speaking of Tyre, and the sense evidently is, that it should not be any more as formerly a place famous for trade.

10th. It is rendered *never* in the following places. 2 Sam. 12 : 10. Judg. 2 : 1. Psalm 15 : 5. 30 : 6. 31 : 1. 55 : 22. 71 : 1. and 119 : 93. Prov. 10 : 30. Isai. 14 : 20. 25 : 2. Ezek. 26 : 21. Joel 2 : 26, 27. But surely no one ever thought that *never* in these texts expresses endless duration. For example, was the sword not to depart from David’s house to the endless ages of eternity? And was God’s covenant with Israel to have no end? We are sure it has waxed old and vanished away. In short, we use the word *never* every day in a similar way, but no one interprets our language as meaning endless duration. In the New Testament we shall see that the word *aion* is also rendered *never*, and is applied in a similar way.

SECTION II.

ALL THE PASSAGES NOTICED, WHERE OLIM IS USED, AND
RENDERED BY WORDS WHICH CONVEY THE IDEA OF END-
LESS DURATION.

If the sacred writers used the term *olim*, to express limited duration in so many instances, as we have seen in the preceding Section, our translators rendering the same word by English terms expressing endless duration, can never give it such a signification.

In the texts now to be introduced, they have rendered *olim* by the words perpetual, everlasting, eternal, forever, and forever and ever; but can such renderings alter the sense in which the sacred writers used it? No; for we shall see that the things to which it is applied, and the scope of the contexts, in a great many instances, at least, utterly forbids it. This is universally acknowledged, and will presently be seen from the passages. It will be perceived, that this word is used to express duration that is past. The reader has then to consider whether it refers to *endless* duration which is past. It also expresses duration to come, and it must be considered whether it is used to express a proper eternity to come. In short we have to examine, with attention, whether this word rendered perpetual, eternal, forever, and forever and ever, was designed to express the endless duration of the things to which the sacred writers apply it. The question is not, are the persons or things to which it is applied of endless duration in their natures, but was this term used to express it? Is it this word which shows they are of endless duration?

1st. I find *olim* then is rendered "*perpetual*," and applied in the following manner. The covenant God made with Noah was to be "for perpetual generations," Gen. 9: 12. The priest's office, was to be Aaron's and his son's, "for a perpetual statute," Exod. 29: 9. The suburbs of certain cities, were to be the inheritance of the Levites, "for a perpetual possession," Levit. 25: 34. Certain portions were to be the provision of Aaron and his sons, by "a perpetual statute," Levit. 24: 9. It was to be, "a perpetual statute," that the person who sprinkled the water of separation, should be unclean until the even, Num. 19: 21. The sabbath, was to be observed by

the children of Israel throughout their generations, "for a perpetual covenant," *Exod.* 31 : 16. To them it was also to be "a perpetual statute," that they should neither eat fat nor blood, *Levit.* 3 : 17. The meat-offering was to be a "perpetual ordinance unto the Lord," *Ezek.* 46 : 14. And the children of Israel are spoken of as saying, come and let us join ourselves to the Lord in "a perpetual covenant," *Jer.* 50 : 5. In all these passages, the word perpetual is applied to things belonging to the Mosaic dispensation, which was never intended to be endless in its duration. *Olim* is rendered perpetual in these passages, and it is rendered everlasting in others, and applied to the same things. Indeed, had our translators consulted uniformity in their version, they would have always rendered it so. What then does perpetual or everlasting express, when applied to the things belonging to the Jewish dispensation? We think it is obvious that it simply signifies that those things were to be observed by the Jews while that dispensation continued. When it ended the everlasting or perpetual ended.

But further; we find *olim* rendered perpetual, and applied as follows. Speaking of Babylon and other places, it is said they shall be made "perpetual desolations," *Jer.* 25 : 9. 12. *Ezek.* 35 : 9. *Zeph.* 2 : 9. And of Bozrah and other cities, that they shall be "perpetual wastes," *Jer.* 49 : 13. And speaking of some persons it is said, *Psalms* 78 : 66. that God would put them to "a perpetual reproach." God also threatened Israel, *Jer.* 18 : 16. to make their land a "perpetual hissing;" and bring on them "a perpetual shame," 23 : 40. Concerning the people of Seir it is said, that they had against Israel "a perpetual hatred," *Ezek.* 35 : 5. Of some persons it is said, they shall sleep "a perpetual sleep," *Jer.* 51 : 39. and repeated, verse 57. Besides, we find it said *Jer.* 5 :

22. that the Lord placed "the sand for the bound of the sea by a perpetual decree that it cannot pass it." Moreover, we find it declared, Hab. 3: 6. that the hills are perpetual. "He stood, and measured the earth: he beheld, and drove asunder the nations: and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow: his ways are everlasting." In this last text, *olim* is rendered both perpetual and everlasting, and without scruple is applied to the hills and mountains as well as to the ways of God. These are all the texts in which *olim* is rendered in our version perpetual. On the whole of them I shall now make a few brief remarks.

1st. It is evident from the last quoted text, that perpetual and everlasting are used to express the same idea. The "everlasting mountains," and "the perpetual hills," are synonymous expressions. When it is therefore said, that the mountains and hills are perpetual or everlasting, no one ever inferred that they had existed from eternity, or would exist to endless duration. The everlasting nature of their existence as to time past, is limited to the time of their creation, and in regard to futurity, their existence is bounded by the dissolution of the present world. Here then is an everlasting, bounded by time, and does not extend to endless duration either as to past or future.

2d. In all the above texts where *olim* is rendered perpetual, it is never used to express endless duration. The things to which it is applied clearly decide this. Unless this world is to continue to endless duration, how is the sand to be a perpetual bound to the sea, and the hills and mountains never cease to exist? Moreover, how is Babylon and other places to be endless desolations? In short if perpetual expresses endless duration, some are to sleep to endless duration. The question perhaps

may then be asked, How long does perpetual mean in the above texts? To this I answer, that in all of them it does not designate the same period of time. The longest period expressed by it is not extended beyond the existence of this world. In the place where it is said some were to sleep a perpetual sleep, the Babylonians are referred to; they were asleep when their city was taken, and being killed while asleep, they no more awoke in this world, and hence their sleep is called perpetual. If perpetual is understood to mean endless, those persons are never to be raised from the dead. Such, then, as maintain a universal resurrection of all the dead, must give up the idea that *olim*, rendered perpetual, signifies a proper eternity.

3d. Let it be noticed that in none of the above texts is a reference made to the punishment of the wicked in a future state. But even admitting, that in a number of them it had been expressly declared, that the wicked, and the wicked in a future state of existence, should be punished with perpetual torments, this would prove nothing conclusive that these torments were to have no end. This must be obvious to every man who considers how often perpetual is applied to things which have ended, and to things also which we are sure are to end. From the common usage of this word, we ought to conclude that the torments of the wicked may come to an end also. But as nothing is said about future punishment in any of the above texts, we need not trouble ourselves with any further remarks concerning them. I may just add, what difference can it make as to the meaning of the word *olim*, whether we render it everlasting or perpetual? Can the rendering alter the true sense of the writer?

2d. We find also that *olim* is rendered *everlasting*. The covenant that God made with Noah and every

living creature, is called "the everlasting covenant," Gen. 9: 16. Also, that which he made with Abraham and his seed, is called "an everlasting covenant," Gen. 17: 7, 13, 19. It is called the same when confirmed to Israel, 1 Chron. 16: 17. Psalm 105: 10. and also when made to David, 2 Sam. 23: 5. And it is said of Israel, Isai. 24: 5. that they had "broken the everlasting covenant." In the following places, an everlasting covenant is spoken of, and seems to refer to the new covenant, Isai. 55: 3. and 61: 8. Jer. 32: 40. Ezek. 16: 60. and 37: 26. But in whatever way this may be decided, all will allow, that it must end when Christ delivers up the kingdom to God the father. The new dispensation, or age of the Messiah, is not called everlasting because it is endless in its duration, but because when it ends it is to be succeeded by no other. But further, we find the land of Canaan promised to Israel for "an everlasting possession," Gen. 17: 8. and 48: 4. The priesthood given to Aaron and his sons, was to be "an everlasting priesthood." But as an explanation of what is meant, it is added, "throughout your generations." See Exod. 40: 15. Numb. 25: 13. Certain things under the Aaronical priesthood, and connected with that covenant, called everlasting, though temporary in its duration, were to be for an "everlasting statute," Levit. 24: 8, 16, 24. In Gen. 49: 26. we read of the everlasting hills, and in Hab. 3: 6. of the everlasting mountains, and in Psalm 24: 7, 9. of the everlasting doors, probably referring to the doors of the temple.

Before adducing any more of the texts in which *olim* is rendered everlasting, I beg leave to make one or two remarks. It is easily perceived, by comparing these texts with those where *olim* is rendered perpetual, that everlasting and perpetual express the same idea. Further; unless we can prove, that the

land of Canaan, the statutes and ordinances of the Jewish dispensation, the hills and mountains, and the doors of the temple are to continue to endless duration, we ought not to say that the word everlasting expresses a proper eternity. We presume no one would contend that it does, but some perhaps would say, that it does express the endless duration of the new covenant, mentioned in some of the above passages. But why should it any more mean this when applied to it, than when applied to the old covenant, which was called everlasting, yet has long ago vanished? Is it then asked, What does everlasting mean in the above texts? I answer: it expresses a period of time, long, indefinite, and limited. Do we read of the priesthood of Aaron being everlasting? We find this, in as many words limited, for it is added, "throughout your generations." In a word, any long period of time, either past, or to come, is called everlasting. Yea, we shall see before we are done, that it sometimes expresses even a short period of time. Nor are the sacred writers under any apprehension that they were liable to be misunderstood. But to return.

We find further, *olim* rendered everlasting, and applied as follows. In Isai. 45: 17. it is said—"But Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation." This is explained by what follows: "ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end." See this text noticed before. Daniel 9: 24. speaks of an "everlasting righteousness," and David, Psalm 112: 6. says "the righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance." In Prov. 10: 25. they are also said to be "an everlasting foundation." David prays, Psalm 139: 24. "lead me in the way everlasting." And in Jer. 31: 3. God says "I have loved thee with an everlasting love. And in Isaiah 60: 19, 20. it is twice said that "God is their ever-

lasting light." And in Isai. 35 : 10. they shall come to Zion with "everlasting joy." This is repeated, 51 : 11. and 61 : 7. In Isai. 56 : 5. God is said to give them an "everlasting name," and to have made to himself "an everlasting name," Isai. 63 : 12. In Isai. 55 : 13. we read of an "everlasting sign," and by way of explanation it is added, "which shall not be cut off." And in Isai. 54 : 8. we read of God's "everlasting kindness." Speaking of the Jews, God threatened that he would bring upon them "an everlasting reproach." Jer. 23 : 40. And in Jer. 20 : 11. it is added, "their everlasting confusion shall never be forgotten." By consulting the context of these two last texts it may be seen that God is not speaking of punishment to the Jews in a future state, but of his temporal judgments in the present world. Notwithstanding this, their punishment is called everlasting. This we have shown, in the Inquiry into the words Sheol, &c. which see. See also on 2 Thess. chap. 1. below.

We come now to a part of this Inquiry where *olim* is rendered everlasting, and is applied to God himself. Such texts, then, demand the closest attention. I find it then said, Gen. 21 : 33. that Abraham "called upon the name of the Lord, the everlasting God." In Isai. 40 : 28. he is again called the "everlasting God." And in Deut. 33 : 27. we read of his "everlasting arms." In Psalm 90 : 2. it is said "even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God." And in Jer. 10 : 10. he is called "an everlasting king." In Psalm 100 : 5. it is said "his mercy is everlasting." In 103 : 17. it is added, "the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting." But by way of explanation it is said "his righteousness unto childrens' children." In 41 : 13. it is said, "blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting, and to everlasting." This is repeated, Psalm 106 : 48. Again it is said Psalm 93 :

2. "thou art from everlasting," but in the first part of the verse it was said as an equivalent expression—"thy throne is established of old." In Isai. 63 : 16. it is said—"thy name is from everlasting," and Psalm 145 : 13. David says, "thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom;" but observe it is added by way of explanation, "and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations." In the margin our translators have put, "of all ages." And in Isai. 26 : 4. it is said, "in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength," but in the margin they have put, "rock of ages." These are all the passages, where *olim* is rendered everlasting and applied to God. There are two passages where it is so rendered and applied to the Messiah. The first is Mic. 5 : 2. "whose goings forth hath been from of old, from everlasting." See on this text professor Stuart's remarks, quoted, Sect. 1. Here, *from of old* and *everlasting* are used as synonymous expressions for the same thing. This is similar to Psalm 93 : 2. noticed above. The other text is Prov. 8 : 23. "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was." Here what is called *everlasting* in the first part is explained in the second to be, "from the beginning." Has everlasting or a proper eternity a beginning?

3d. We find *olim* rendered for evermore in the following places. Thus it is said Psalm 92 : 8. "but thou, Lord, art most high for evermore." And 113 : 2. "blessed be the name of the Lord from this time forth and for evermore." And 115 : 18. "but we will bless the Lord from this time forth and for evermore." Again it is said, 2 Sam. 22 : 51. the Lord "showeth mercy to his anointed, unto David, and to his seed for evermore." This is repeated, Psalm 18 : 50. In 1 Chron. 17 : 14. God promised that Solomon's throne "should be established for evermore." And Psalm 121 : 8. he promised to preserve

Israel, "for evermore." And 133: 3. to command "the blessing for evermore." In Ezek. 37: 26, 28. he also promised to set his sanctuary in the midst of Israel "for evermore." And in Psalm 37: 27. David says, "depart from evil and do good, and dwell for evermore." And in 86: 12. says, "I will glorify thy name for evermore." The only other text in which *olim* is rendered for evermore, is Psalm 106: 31. and is thus explained. Speaking of Phineas it is said, that what he did "was counted unto him for righteousness, unto all generations for evermore." Here *all generations* and *for evermore* are used as equivalent expressions for the same thing. On the whole of these texts we would remark, that *evermore* is applied to things which never were intended to continue to endless duration. Such were Solomon's throne, and God's sanctuary among the children of Israel. A long period may be meant, but not surely a proper eternity. Even when evermore is applied to God, we cannot conclude that it signifies endless duration; for it is explained to mean "all generations." In none of these texts is *evermore* applied to punishment. No further notice need then be taken of them here, as any further remarks will be more in place afterwards.

4th. *Olim* is rendered *forever*, in the following places, and expresses the duration of a man's lifetime, or even a shorter period. Thus it is said, Deut. 15: 17. "thou shalt take an awl and thrust it through his ear unto the door, and he shall be thy servant forever." Now this could only be all the servant's lifetime, or perhaps to the year of jubilee. It could not be beyond his life, for at death the servant is free from his master. The same thing is said Exod. 21: 6. But again, we find Samuel's mother saying, 1 Sam. 1: 22. "I will not go up until the child be weaned, and then I will bring him, that he may ap-

pear before the Lord, and abide there forever." Here, forever can mean no more than all the days of Samuel's life. Again; Jonadab commanded his children that they should drink "no more wine forever." Jer. 35: 6. Does not this simply mean all their days, or at furthest, throughout their generation? And is not something similar meant, when Achish said of David, 1 Sam. 27: 12. "he shall be my servant forever?" And also Levit. 25: 46. where it is said, strangers shall be to Israel "bond men forever." And 2 Kings 5: 27. it is said, that the leprosy was to cleave to Naaman "forever." But who ever thought this man was to be a leper to the endless ages of eternity? In Job 41: 4. speaking of leviathan, it is said, "wilt thou take him for a servant forever?" There is one text which deserves particular notice, because it is the first time in which the word *olim* is used in the Bible, and is rendered forever. Thus it is said, Gen. 3: 22. "and now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever," therefore God drove forth the man from the garden. On this text let us hear Dr. Kennicot, the great Hebrew scholar of his day. He says, dissent, 1. p. 83. "A third objection may be made to the present rendering of the word *לעלם*, in chap. 3: 22.—that it is made to signify *the days of Adam's life only*, and not *forever*. In answer to this I observe, that the word *לעלם* is used as often, perhaps, finitely as infinitely; and that it can signify nothing more than the age or life of man, in places where our translators have frequently rendered it *forever*. Thus Exod. 21: 6.—'Then his master shall bring him unto the judges, and he shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever.' And 1 Sam. 1: 22. 'but Hannah went not up; for she said, I will not go up until the child be weaned; and then I will bring him, that he may appear before the Lord, and

“he abide forever.” But further, we find Bathsheba says, 1 Kings 1: 31. “Let my lord king David live forever.” And in Neh. 2: 3. he says to king Xerxes, “Let the king live forever.” See the same or similar language, Dan. 2: 4. 3: 9. 5: 10. 6: 6, 21. All meant in these texts is, let the king’s life be long, or the years of his life be many. No persons never supposed that kings could live to endless ages of eternity. In Exod. 14: 13. it is said to Israel, that the Egyptians whom they saw to die, they should see “no more forever.” No more is meant, than that they should not see them again, and the reason is obvious, for they were all drowned in the sea.

In the following texts we find certain places are said to be forever, which cannot mean that they shall continue to endless duration. In Eccles. 1: 4. it is said, “the earth abideth forever.” And Psalm 104: 5. “who laid the foundations of the earth, that they should not be removed forever.” And Psalm 78: 69. “He built his sanctuary like high palaces, like the earth which he hath established forever.” God said to give the land of Canaan to Abraham and his seed, that they should dwell in it forever; and he should be their prince forever. See Ezek. 37: 25. In all the following texts the land of Canaan is expressly said to be forever to Abraham and his seed. Gen. 13: 15. Exod. 32: 13. 1 Chron. 28: 8. 2 Chron. 20: 7. Isai. 60: 21. Josh. 14: 9. This last refers to that part of the land given to Caleb, which was to be his, and his children’s forever. And not some lands deeded away forever now in a larger sense? Israel is commanded, not to seek the wealth, nor the wealth of the inhabitants of Canaan forever, Ezra 9: 12. In Deut. 23: 6. we have the same injunction repeated, and it is added, “all thy days forever.” Here *all thy days* and *forever* are us-

ed to express the same period of time, and simply mean throughout the generations of Israel. It was a sign between the Lord and Israel forever, that in six days God made heaven and earth, and rested on the seventh, Exod. 31: 17. The children of Israel dwelling in Canaan, or inheriting it forever, is contrary to fact. For nearly two thousand years the Jews have been cast out of it, and should they return to-day, and dwell in it as long as this earth shall continue, yet unless the world is to be of endless duration, forever does not express an infinite period of time. It is further said 1 Chron. 23: 25. the Lord God of Israel hath given rest unto his people, that they may dwell in Jerusalem forever." And Jer. 17: 25. it is said, "and this city shall remain forever." And referring to it, David says, Psalm 48: 8. "God will establish it forever." And Jer. 31: 40. it is said, "it shall not be plucked up, nor thrown down any more forever." And in Psalm 125: 1. it is said, "they that trust in the Lord shall be like mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abide forever." And referring to the temple, Solomon says, 1 Kings 8: 13. "I have surely built thee a house to dwell in, a settled place for thee to abide in forever." For substance repeated, 2 Chron. 6: 2. And in 2 Chron. 30: 8. it is said to be "sanctified forever." But what is meant by Jerusalem remaining "forever," is explained thus, Joel 3: 20. "but Judah shall dwell forever, and *Jerusalem from generation to generation.*" Again Josh. 8: 28. it is said, "Joshua burnt Ai and made it an heap forever." It is added by way of explanation, "even a desolation unto this day." And of Babylon it is said, Isai. 47: 7. "I shall be a lady forever." But God says concerning this city, Jer. 51: 26. "thou shalt be desolate forever." And verse 62. it is added, "none shall remain in it, neither man or beast, but it shall be deso-

fate forever." Of Hazor and other cities it is said, they "shall be a dwelling for dragons, and a desolation forever: there shall no man abide there, nor any son of man dwell in it," Jer. 49: 33. And of another place it is said, "the smoke thereof shall go up forever," and that the wild beasts "shall possess it forever," Isai. 34: 14, 17. The explanation of forever in the last text is given thus: "from generation to generation it shall lie waste," and "from generation to generation wild beasts shall dwell therein." See verses 8—17. In Psalm 49: 11. it is said that the inward thought of the wicked is, that their houses shall continue "forever." But the explanation given is—"and their dwelling-places to all generations."

The word *olim* is rendered forever, and applied in a variety of ways to the laws and ordinances of the Mosaic dispensation. It was a statute "forever throughout their generations" that they should not sacrifice their children to devils, Levit. 17: 7. Nor eat of the fruits of the land, until they had brought a part of it unto the Lord, Levit. 23: 14. It was an ordinance forever throughout their generations, that the stranger and the children of Israel were to be alike in offering certain offerings to the Lord, Num. 15: 15. and 19: 10. It was also a statute "forever unto their generations," that Aaron and his sons should enjoy certain things, and perform certain parts of service, Exod. 27: 21. Levit. 24: 3. Exod. 28: 43. 29: 28. and 30: 21. Levit. 6: 18, 22. 7: 34, 36. and 10: 9, 15. Numb. 10: 8. and 18: 8, 11, 19, 23. 1 Chron. 15: 2. and 23: 13. 2 Chron. 2: 4. Exod. 12: 14. comp. verses 17, 24. Levit. 23: 41. Comp. verses 33—41. Levit. 16: 31. comp. verse 29. and 23: 31. The laws and ordinances enjoined in these texts, all relate to the old dispensation, which has vanished away. But all must see they were to

be observed "forever," and the fact shows that endless duration could not possibly be meant by this expression. The children of Israel were a peculiar people, separated from all other nations, and for certain important purposes, which would be aside from our present purpose to detail. Such laws and ordinances were to be observed by them "forever," and this forever was as long as they existed as a nation, and until the purposes of God were answered by them. Hence "in your generations," and "throughout your generations," or some similar explanatory expression is used. Both seem to express, the continued practice of those laws and ordinances, but not the endless duration of their observance. This law was added because of transgression "till the seed should come." In the hope of the promise of the Messiah being fulfilled, the twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hoped to come. When Christ had fulfilled all that was written of him, it was virtually abolished, and Paul declared in his day, it had waxed old and was ready to vanish away. The "forever" was bounded by this period, and this was even a longer forever than some others spoken of in Scripture.

In the following texts, forever seems to express a long, indefinite period of time, but not endless duration. In Exod. 19: 9. the reason given for God's speaking to Moses in a cloud is, that the people might believe him "forever." But does forever mean any thing more, than that Moses might be believed by all the future generations of Israel. It is also said, Ezek. 43: 7. that God is to dwell in the midst of Israel "forever." But can this signify to endless duration? Can it mean any thing more than what is said so often by way of explanation, "from generation to generation," or throughout their generations? See also verse 9. David says of God's commandments,

that they were "ever with him," Psalm 119 : 98. But does this mean any thing more than a continuance in them? But further, had Saul obeyed the Lord, Samuel told him that the Lord would have established his kingdom upon Israel "forever," 1 Sam. 13 : 13. But I ask every candid man, did not Samuel mean that the kingdom would have been hereditary in Saul's family, or as the Scriptures say, he should not have wanted "a man to sit on the throne?" David, on whom Saul's kingdom was bestowed, says; that God chose him before all the house of his father "to be a king over Israel forever," 1 Chron. 28 : 4. But did David mean, that he and his seed should sit to endless duration on a throne in Israel? Is not the meaning simply this—that the kingdom should be hereditary in his family so long as Israel existed as a nation? We think this is evident from 2 Chron. 13 : 5. where it is said, "ought ye not to know, that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom over Israel to David forever, even to him and his sons by a covenant of salt?" Comp. 2 Chron. 9 : 8. Besides, notice what is said, Psalm 89 : 4. in confirmation of this, and in explanation of the meaning of the phrase "forever." It is said, "thy seed will I establish forever;" but it is added, "and build up thy throne to all generations." All generations is surely not endless duration! Admitting that this ultimately referred to the Messiah, who was to be of the seed of David, yet it was understood of David's descendants. This seems evident from similar things being said of Solomon. See, 1 Chron. 17 : 23. 1 Kings 2 : 45. 2 Sam. 7 : 13. 16. 25. 1 Chron. 22 : 10. and 28 : 7. which I need not transcribe. It is also evident from the intrigues and attempts of David's sons and others to usurp the throne. The same is said of the Messiah, Isai. 9 : 7. "of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of

David, and upon his kingdom to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." But even when forever is here applied to him, we doubt if this expresses the endless duration of his reign, but simply expresses that it shall never give place to any other in this world. One or two of our reasons for thinking so we shall only here state.

1st. If "forever," and "no end," in this passage, means endless duration, it must be allowed that this world must also continue to endless duration. Is it asked how I make this appear? I answer, that it is plainly said, that of the *increase* of his government there shall be no end. But how is this to take place if this world is to end? The increase of his government takes place in this world, nor does any one refer its increase to a period after it ends. Either then this world has no end, but shall continue to afford an increase of subjects to Messiah's kingdom, or forever, and no end, here does not mean endless duration. We never heard of any increase of subjects to Christ's kingdom but while this world continued.

2d. Christ's kingdom or his reign, is represented like the duration of the sun or the host of heaven. Psalm 72. is allowed to refer to him. In verse 19. it is said, and blessed be his glorious name. And in verse 17. we find it said, his name shall endure forever. If we ask, how long a time this forever is, we find it answered thus—his name shall be continued as long as the sun. Again; it is said, Psalm 89: 29. his seed also will I make to endure forever. But it is added—and his throne as the days of heaven. And in verses 36, 37. we find it said—his seed shall endure forever, but it is again subjoined by way of explanation—And his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon.

We think these texts limit the meaning of forever to the duration of the sun and moon, and the Messiah's reign also to this period. This seems to be in agreement with what is said 1 Cor. 15 : 24—29. that when Christ hath subdued all things, he shall deliver up the kingdom to God the father, that he may be all in all. This period is called the end and succeeds the resurrection of the dead.

I am aware that it may be objected,—“if forever is thus limited to the end of this world, will it not follow that Christ's seed must end, for they are said to endure forever, which according to this view is only as long as the sun and moon endureth?” I answer, that this does not follow, for Christ at this period is to deliver up the kingdom to God the father and surely this kingdom includes the subjects or Christ's seed. If delivered up to God, no one thinks that this is for the purpose of being annihilated or to suffer endless punishment.

But further, David prays, that his house might continue blessed before God “forever.” 2 Sam. 7 : 29. 1 Chron. 17 : 27. God promised to establish the throne of Solomon forever, 1 Ks. 9 : 5. David declares himself guiltless before the Lord forever from the blood of Abner, 2 Sam. 3 : 28. Comp. 1 Kings 2 : 23. His kindness was not to be cut off from the house of Jonathan forever, 1 Sam. 20 : 15. Comp. verse 42. But could any thing more be meant by forever, than so long as his house existed? Israel was to be unto God a people forever, 2 Sam. 7 : 24. See also 1 Chron. 17 : 22. Things revealed, belonged to them and their children forever, Deut. 29 : 29. And if they obeyed God, it should go well with them and their children forever, Deut. 12 : 28. and by so doing, they would leave the land unto their children for an inheritance forever, Ezra 9 : 12. And if they did not obey the Lord, the curses in the law should be

upon them for a sign and for a wonder forever, Deut. 28 : 46. Again ; an Ammonite or Moabite was not to enter into the congregation of the Lord forever ; and this is explained to be, to the tenth generation, Deut. 23 : 3. Nehem. 13 : 1. The stones set up at Jordan, were to be a memorial unto the children of Israel forever, Josh. 4 : 7. But did any man ever think that these stones were to stand there to the endless ages of eternity ? If we understand forever to mean, as often explained, from generation to generation, or throughout the generations of Israel, no difficulty is perceived ; but to understand it of endless duration, is absurd. Again ; the Lord had said that the house of Eli should walk before him forever, 1 Sam. 2 : 30. But his conduct and that of his sons was such, that God says, 1 Sam. 3 : 13, 14. " I will judge his house forever." And that " the iniquity of his house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor burnt offerings forever." Some may think that their sins were unpardonable. No ; what seems simply meant, is, that no sacrifice or burnt offering could avail, so as to preserve the priesthood in Eli's family. Again ; Israel is commanded to hope in the Lord forever, Psalm 131 : 3. And in 125 : 2. the Lord is said to be round about them forever ; and 28 : 9. David prays that God would lift up his people forever. And in 1 Chron. 29 : 18. that he would keep what is right in their hearts forever. And Psalm 12 : 7. that he would preserve them from this generation forever. And 37 : 18. says, that the inheritance of the righteous shall be forever. And verse 28. that they are preserved forever. And 41 : 12. that God set him before his face forever. And 73 : 26. that God was his portion forever. And it is said, Isai. 32 : 17. that the effect of righteousness was to be " quietness and assurance forever." In Psalm 30 : 12. David says, " I will give

thanks unto thee forever." And in 44 : 8. that he would "praise God's name forever." See also 52 : 9. In 79 : 13. he says, "we will give thee thanks forever," but adds, as an explanation, "we will show forth thy praise to all generations." And 75 : 9. he says, "I will declare forever," and explains himself thus—"I will sing praises to the God of Jacob." But further, in Psalm 112 : 6. David says, a good man "shall not be moved forever." In 119 : 111. that he had taken God's testimonies "as an heritage forever." And verse 152. "that God had founded them forever." In Psalm 5 : 11. he says, "let them that put their trust in the Lord ever shout for joy." Psalm 61 : 4. David says, "I will abide in thy tabernacle forever." And God says, Hosea 2 : 19. "I will betrothe thee unto me forever." Psalm 45 : 2. and probably speaking of the Messiah, it is said, "God hath blessed thee forever." And in Isai. 59 : 21. it is declared, that God's word was not to depart from him nor his seed "forever." And Psalm 61 : 7. that he shall abide before God "forever." But comparing verse 6. forever is explained thus—"thou wilt prolong the king's life; and his years as many generations." In the margin it is "as generation and generation." comp. Psalm 89 : 36, 37. and 1 Chron. 17 : 14. In 1 Kings 10 : 9. it is said, God "loved Israel forever." And in Deut. 5 : 29. that by "obeying him it would be well with them and their children forever." But again speaking of God's temporal judgments, it is said, Joel 2 : 2. to be a day "there hath not been ever the like." And of the dead it is said, Eccles. 9 : 6. that they have no more a portion "forever" in any thing done under the sun. Speaking of the descendants of Esau, it is said, Obad. 10. that they shall be cut off *forever*. Jonah says, 2 : 6. that the bars of the earth were about him *forever*. In Zach. 1 : 5. the question is asked concerning the prophets,

Do they live *forever*? If forever is asserted to mean endless duration, it is here strongly implied that the prophets do not live forever. But the question here simply means, do the prophets live to all generations. It is said of some, Psalm 81 : 15. that 'their time should have endured forever.' And Solomon, Eccles. 2 : 16. says—'There is no remembrance of the wise more than of the fool forever.' And David says Psal. 49 : 8. 'the redemption of the soul, or the natural life from death, it ceaseth forever.' And in Prov. 27 : 24. it is said of riches—'they are not forever;' but the common explanation is added,—'And doth the crown endure to every generation.'

But I find *olim*, rendered *forever*, applied to God in a variety of ways. These texts demand the closest attention, for it is in consequence of this, that it is considered as expressing endless duration. Can it mean any thing less than this, say some, seeing it is applied to *him* who had no beginning and who shall have no end? This may be true, but it ought not to be admitted without sufficient evidence, seeing this same word is applied to so many things which all allow are not of endless duration. We shall therefore give this part of the subject all the care and attention we can command. *Olim*, then, is rendered *forever* and applied

To the existence of God. Thus in Deut. 32 : 40. God says, 'I live forever.' And in Psalm 9 : 7. 'The Lord shall endure forever.' And 102 : 12. 'thou, O Lord, shalt endure forever,' but observe, it is added by way of explanation, 'and thy remembrance unto all generations.' In Lam. 5 : 19. it is said, 'thou, O Lord, remainest forever;' but the common explanation is again given, for it is added, 'and thy throne from generation to generation.' And it is said, Eccles. 3 : 14. That 'whatsoever God doeth it shall be forever.' It is also applied to *his name or character* in

general. Thus it is said, Exod. 3 : 15. 'This is my name forever,' and explained thus, 'and this is my memorial unto all generations.' His character, name or glory, are the same. Hence it is said, Psalm 104 : 31. 'the glory of the Lord shall endure forever.' And Mic. 2 : 9. 'God complains that his glory was taken away from some 'forever.' In 2 Sam. 7 : 26. it is said, 'let thy name be magnified forever:' and is repeated 1 Chron. 17 : 24. In Psalm 135 : 13. it is said, 'thy name, O! Lord, endureth forever;' but observe it is added again as an explanation, 'and thy memorial, O! Lord, throughout all generations.' In the margin 'to generation and generation.' In all the following passages, which I need not transcribe, God is spoken of as putting his name in his house 'forever.' 1 Kings 9 : 3. 2 Chron. 7 : 16. 2 Kings 21 : 7. 2 Chron. 33 : 4, 7. But to proceed, we find *forever applied to his truth.* Thus it is said, Psalm 117 : 2. 'The truth of the Lord endureth forever.' And in Psalm 146 : 6. 'that he keepeth truth forever.' And in Isai. 40 : 8. 'the word of God shall stand forever.' It is also applied *To his faithfulness.* Accordingly, it is said, Psalm 105 : 8. 'He hath remembered his covenant forever.' What follows by way of explanation deserves particular notice; 'The word which he commanded to a thousand generations.' A thousand generations is a long period of time, but it is not eternity. Again, it is said, Psalm 111 : 9. 'He hath commanded his covenant forever.' And verse 5. 'He will ever be mindful of his covenant.' It is also applied *To his reign and power.* Thus it is said, Psalm 66 : 7. 'He ruleth by his power forever.' And 29 : 10. 'The Lord sitteth king forever.' In Mic. 4 : 7. it is said of Israel, 'The Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion from henceforth even forever.' And Psalm 146 : 10. 'The Lord shall reign forever, even thy God, O Zion.' But here again the com-

mon explanation is given 'unto all generations.' Also *To his wisdom or counsel.* In Psalm 33: 11. 'The counsel of the Lord standeth forever.' But it is said by way of explanation, 'the thought of his heart to all generations.' And *To his righteousness or salvation.* Thus it is said, Isai. 51: 6. 'my salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished.' Now compare with this, verse 8. 'my righteousness shall be forever, and my salvation from generation to generation;' does not 'from generation to generation' here express precisely what is meant by 'forever'?

But I find the word *olim* rendered '*forever*' and *applied to God's mercy.* The expression *for his mercy endureth forever* is found once in each of the following texts. 2 Chron. 5: 13. 20: 21. Ezra 3: 11. Psalm 106: 1. 107: 1. 138: 8. Jer. 33: 11. In each of the following places it occurs twice. 2 Chron. 7: 3, 6. 1 Chron. 16: 34, 41. In Psalm 118: 1—4, 29. it is found five times. And in Psalm 136. it occurs no less than twenty-six times. The expression 'for his mercy endureth forever,' is found then forty-two times in the Old Testament. The reason for being so particular in thus numbering the places will appear presently. Although the following texts do not contain this precise expression, yet it is evident they have an affinity to the present topic. I shall therefore introduce them here, before I proceed to make any remarks on the above expression. David says, Psalm 89: 1. 'I will sing of the mercies of the Lord forever,' and explains it by adding, 'with my mouth will I make known thy faithfulness to all generations.' And well he might, for he says, verse 2. 'Mercy shall be built up forever.' And again explains his meaning by saying, 'thy faithfulness shalt thou establish in the very heavens.' Observe, that in the first of these verses forever is explained in the margin 'to generation and generation.' In the second by

his faithfulness being established in the very heavens seems to be meant, that it should endure as the heavens or throughout all generations. Besides, David says, Psalm 100 : 5. 'For the Lord is good : his mercy is everlasting,' and adds by way of explanation 'and his truth endureth to all generations.' He adds, Psalm 103 : 17. 'But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him,' and it is again added, 'and his righteousness unto children's children.'

On all these texts where it is said, 'for his mercy endureth forever,' with others of a similar nature, I shall now make a few observations.—1st. It is very evident, that the mercy of God formed the burden of song to the Jews in their worship. The God of the Jews was a merciful God, slow to anger and of great kindness. 2d. If it be true, as our orthodox friends assert, that God is as much glorified in the display of his endless wrath against the wicked, as in the display of his endless mercy towards the righteous, how do they account for it, that the phrase 'for his wrath endureth forever' does not occur forty-two times as the phrase 'for his mercy endureth forever?' Why have we not a Psalm, in which it is twenty-six times said, 'O! give thanks unto the Lord for he is good, for his wrath endureth forever.' Nor do we see what objection they could have to singing it, if God is as much glorified by the one as by the other. But supposing such a Psalm found in the Bible, and that they should sing both, would they not celebrate the endless mercy and wrath of the same God towards his own creatures? But I ask, how all this could be reconciled with God's declarations, that mercy rejoiceth against judgment, and that his tender mercies are over his other works. But 3d. we would candidly ask our orthodox brethren, how they account for the extraordinary fact, *that it is not once said that 'the*

wrath of the Lord endureth forever? so far from this being once asserted, it is repeatedly and expressly denied that God's wrath endureth forever. Thus it is said, Psalm 103 : 9. 'He will not always chide; neither will he keep his anger forever.' Again, Isai. 57 : 16. 'For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth : for the spirit should fail before me and the souls which I have made.' No, say our orthodox friends, they shall not fail but shall endure the endless wrath of God. But it is again said, Jer. 3 : 5. 'Will he reserve his anger forever? Will he keep it to the end? Here it is supposed that forever is to end, and hence it is said, verse 12. 'for I am merciful saith the Lord, and I will not keep anger forever. And in Lam. 3 : 31. it is expressly said, 'the Lord will not cast off forever.' Further, David says, Psalm 85 : 5. 'Wilt thou be angry with us forever?' but he adds by way of explanation, 'wilt thou draw out thine anger to all generations?' And Psalm 77 : 8. says, 'is his mercy clean gone forever? Doth his promise fail for evermore?' Notice here, that as forever and for evermore are expressions which convey to an English reader the same idea, so did the original word *olim* to the sacred writers. This appears also from other passages. It is beyond all debate, that it is never once said, that the anger or wrath of God endureth forever. We solemnly call on any man to produce a single instance where this is said by any Old Testament writer. By what authority then do men in our day preach that God's wrath is to endure forever? Is it like men who reverence the sacred oracles, to speak of the everlasting anger and eternal wrath of God, yet can produce no example from them of such modes of speaking? Yea, I ask every candid man if it is possible to select words, which could more clearly and emphatically deny that God's wrath en-

dureth forever, than is done in the above passages? Granting then, for argument's sake, that *olim* rendered forever, expresses endless duration, and that God's wrath or anger means punishment, no language could more definitely declare, that punishment is not of endless duration. Were I contending for a victory over the believers in endless punishment, it would be good policy in me to allow, that *olim*, rendered forever, expresses this, and the above texts would be direct positive proof, that it is not of endless duration. Our orthodox friends in contending for this must perceive, that their doctrine of endless punishment is overturned from its base by the above passages. But I disclaim any contention for victory. My object is to examine what is truth, and embrace it whatever it may be, for this only can stand, or be of any real benefit to the human race. 4th. But granting, for the sake of argument, that God's wrath was as much celebrated in the Bible as his mercy, and that the endless duration of it was as often asserted, permit me to ask, what worse could be sung of an Eastern despot, or of the devil, allowing such a fallen angel to exist? We seriously urge our brethren who believe such a doctrine, to consider if such a God can appear to any person very lovely, or is likely to be loved. None can love him, but those who can persuade themselves that they are his particular favorites. Even this may be doubted, for a being of this character may turn their enemy tomorrow, and display his endless wrath upon them. All the apparent love and obedience which they pretend to pay him, it is to be feared, arises more from terror of, than love to him; and if a song of endless mercy and endless wrath are both alike orthodox, orthodoxy must be a very singular kind of thing.

To get rid of these and other serious difficulties which might be urged, it may be said, "in all the

above texts where it is denied that God's wrath endureth forever, the writers are not speaking of God's wrath in a future state of existence, but only in the present life." Well, how does this relieve the difficulties, unless it is proved from some other texts, that God says his wrath shall endure forever in a future state of existence? But can this be proved? No: this very attempt to escape from the difficulties, only shows the impossibility of making any escape, for if the above texts wholly refer to the present life, how happens it that they are the only texts where *forever* and the wrath of God are associated, and in them it is expressly denied that his wrath does endure forever? If denied in them, and found in no other, it settles the question, that God's wrath does not endure throughout all generations, far less in an eternal state of existence. But is it not rather silly to make the inspired writers say, that God's wrath does not endure forever in the present life, yet contend for this in a future state without any Scripture authority? Who needed to be told that God's punishment of men in this world was not of endless duration?

5th. We come now to those texts in which *olim* is repeated, and is rendered "forever and ever." I find then, that *forever and ever* is used and applied to the following things, in the following ways. David says, Psalm 119: 44.—I shall keep thy law continually, forever and ever. And in Mic. 4: 5.—We will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and ever. And Dan. 12: 3.—they that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars forever and ever. And David says of God's judgments, that—'they stand fast forever and ever.' Ps. 111: 8. What is meant by this forever and ever, and whether it was intended to express endless duration may be learned from the following texts. In Jer. 7: 7. if Israel amended their ways, then said God, "will I cause

you to dwell in this place in the land that I gave to your fathers forever and ever." It is very evident, that if forever and ever expresses endless duration of time, on the above consideration Israel were to dwell in Judea time without end. But who ever entertained such an idea? Is not the meaning evidently from generation to generation, or throughout all generations, while they continued a nation? Again it is said, Isai. 30: 8. "Now go write it in a book, that it may be for the time to come, forever and ever." The forever and ever here, is called *the time to come*, which time appears to be not endless duration, but simply the future generations of Israel. See the context. If time to come be a proper explanation of forever, it cannot refer to eternity unless we think eternity *time*. But is not time always distinguished from eternity? What is meant by forever and ever, seems plainly stated in Psalm 148: 5, 6. speaking of the host of heaven, it is said, "he commanded, and they were created. He hath also established them forever and ever." But is the host of heaven, or the sun, moon, and stars to continue to endless duration? This must be maintained, or we must give up the idea that forever and ever expresses a proper eternity. We have seen above, that forever is applied to the host of heaven, and from the very nature of the case, forever and ever here cannot express a longer period of time. Both seem to be limited by the duration of this world. Again, God speaking, Isai. 34: 10. of his temporal judgments on all nations, particularly on Idumea, says, in highly figurative language, "the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it forever and ever." Compare verse 17. Let it be noticed on this text, that forever, and forever and ever, mean

the same duration of time, and both these are explained by the phrase "from generation to generation."

But I find *olim* repeated, and rendered forever and ever, and applied to God in the following places.—*In ascriptions of praise to him.* Thus it is said; "Blessed be thou Lord God of Israel our father forever and ever." 1 Chron. 29: 10. The same for substance is repeated in chap. 16: 36. and Neh. 9: 5. And in Psalm 145: 1. it is said, "I will bless thy name forever and ever;" and verse 2. "I will praise thy name forever and ever;" and verse 21. "Let all flesh bless his holy name forever and ever." It is also applied to *The existence of God.* Thus in Dan. 12: 7. the man clothed in linen "swore by him that liveth forever and ever." And David says, Psalm 48: 14. "For this God is our God forever and ever." Also to *God's reign.* Accordingly it is said, Exod. 15: 18. "The Lord shall reign forever and ever." And in Psalm 10: 16. it is said, "The Lord is king forever and ever." And in Psalm 45: 6. "Thy throne O! God, is forever and ever." Also to *the mercy of God.* Thus it is said, Psalm 52: 8. "I trust in the mercy of God forever and ever." It seems also to be applied to *the Messiah*; "He asked life of thee and thou gavest it him, even length of days forever and ever," Psalm 21: 4. And 45: 17. "I will make thy name to be remembered in all generations: therefore shall the people praise thee forever and ever." Now suffer me to ask here—Does not the phrase, all generations, in the first part of this verse, explain, or express the very same thing as forever and ever in the last part, and is it not in unison with the common explanation so often given above, where *olim* is rendered forever?

In looking back on all the texts introduced in these two Sections, let the reader notice the following

ings. All the texts in the first show that the word expresses limited duration, and was so understood by our translators, for they render it by English words which do not convey the idea of endless duration. Again, the greater part of the passages in the Sections show, that the word *olim*, in whatever way rendered, was applied by the sacred writers to things of temporary duration. This we think is indisputable. Again, it has been seen that *olim*, whether applied to temporary things or to God, is explained by the inspired writers to mean *throughout generations*, or by some similar expression. Why such explanations at all, if the word means *end-duration*? And why was it given, when God is spoken of, as well as when it expresses the duration of any thing else, if it expresses his endless duration? Again: in none of the above passages is the word used to express the duration of punishment to the wicked. All the texts where it is supposed to be used to express this, will be considered in the next section. The long detail of texts in the two preceding Sections, perhaps, may appear dry and uninteresting to some readers; but it was absolutely necessary to pursue this course to come at a full and fair understanding of the Scriptural meaning and general use of the word *olim*, so variously rendered in the common version.

SECTION III.

ALL THE TEXTS WHERE OLIM OCCURS, IS RENDERED BY WORDS WHICH CONVEY THE IDEA OF ENDLESS DURATION, AND APPLIED TO PUNISHMENT, PARTICULARLY CONSIDERED.

IN the preceding Section, we have seen the term *olim*, rendered perpetual, everlasting, and forever, and used to express the duration of the punishment of certain *places*, Isai. 34 : 9—17. and Jer. 49 : 13. We are now to bring into view the texts where it is used to express the punishment of *persons*, in whatever way it is rendered in the common version. Jer. 23 : 39, 40. is the first we shall notice. "Therefore I, even I, will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you and your fathers, and cast you out of my presence : and I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten." comp. Jer. 20 : 11. It has been shown, in the Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c. that this passage refers to the punishment of the Jewish nation, and deserves no further notice here. See on 2 Thess. chap. 1. below, and on Matth. chap. 24, 25. Indeed, few will question this.

Jer. 17 : 4. "For ye have kindled a fire in mine anger, which shall burn forever." It is so evident from verses 1—4. that the prophet is speaking of Judah, the sin of Judah, and the punishment of Judah, and this punishment was of a temporal nature, that

it would be a waste of time to offer any remarks on this passage.

Isai. 33 : 14. 'The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites: who among us shall dwell with devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?' Having considered this passage in my Inquiry to the words Sheol, Hades, &c. to it I refer the reader for an illustration.

Psaln 9 : 5. 'Thou hast rebuked the heathen, thou hast destroyed the wicked, thou hast put out their name forever and ever.' It would be useless to spend time in showing, that this text has no reference to punishment in a future state. No sensible orthodox man would urge it, and no man who consults the context, can help seeing that it has no reference to such a subject.

Mal. 1 : 4. 'Whereas Edom saith, we are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the Lord of hosts, they shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them the border of wickedness, and the people against whom the Lord hath indignation forever.' The prophet is here speaking of Edom as a people or nation, and it is plain from the context, that the indignation mentioned, is not in a future state, but God's temporal vengeance on that people. The meaning of the passage evidently is, 'the people against whom the Lord hath indignation from generation to generation,' as explained frequently in the preceding Section.

Dan. 12 : 2. 'And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.' The principal question to be considered from this passage is—Did Daniel here speak of the everlasting punishment of the wicked? If he did, he delivered it in plainer language than any other sacred writer,

and in a book which contains predictions clothed in highly figurative language. Our orthodox friends do not depend much on the Old Testament for proof of the doctrine of endless misery, and as this is the strongest, yea, I may say the only text, which they generally quote from it in proof we shall give it a particular consideration.

The passage then says—‘And at that time.’ At what time? Let the question be asked. The time evidently, of which Daniel had been speaking, chap. 11. This will not be disputed, for it is plain that the first four verses of chap. 12. connect with the matters stated in the 11th chapter. The things mentioned are said to take place at the period called *that time*, chap. 12: 1. whatever time this may be. This time, we think, is easily ascertained, from considering of what people Daniel was speaking. It is plain he referred to the Jews, for in verse 1. they are twice called ‘thy people,’ or Daniel’s people, who certainly were Jews. Let us then see how the events mentioned agree to Daniel’s people. It is, then, said, ‘and at that time,’ which time is called, chap. 11: 40. ‘the time of the end.’ But this provokes the question—What end? I answer, the end of the Jewish age or dispensation. Is it asked, what proof have we of this? I answer, in chap. 11. verse 31. ‘*the abomination that maketh desolate*’ is expressly mentioned, which passage our Lord quotes, Matth. 24: 15. and applies it to the Romans, by whom the Jewish temple and city were destroyed at the end of the age. See the whole of chap. 11. for other circumstances which corroborate this. It will be shown afterwards, that the period called ‘the end,’ chap. 11. and ‘that time,’ chap. 12: 1. exactly agree to the end of the Jewish dispensation, which is repeatedly called ‘the end of the world,’ or age, in the New Testament. It is then said, at that time ‘*shall*

Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people. It is difficult to say with certainty, who was referred to by Michael, nor is this necessary to be determined in the present discussion. The most probable opinion we have seen is, that Michael the great prince refers to Messiah, called the prince of the Jews in other parts of the book of Daniel, and the prince of life, and prince of the kings of the earth, in other parts of Scripture. It is supposed by Pierce and others, that certain angels presided over different parts of the world before the coming of Christ, but all of them now are put in subjection to him. During the period which preceded his coming, it is supposed he was the person who presided over the Jewish nation. But it would be aside from my present object to enter further into this question.

The passage proceeds to say—‘And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time.’ Our Lord refers to these very words, Matth. 24: 21. and applies them to the great tribulations which came on the Jews in the destruction of their city and temple at the end of the age. ‘For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved.’ Who can doubt, after reading this, that Daniel referred to the end of the age, and the tribulations which came on the Jewish nation? He could refer to no other, unless it can be proved, that there have been two different times of such calamity, that the like had never been since there was a nation, or from the beginning of the world. We think this conclusively shows to what period, to what people, and to what calamities the prophet referred.

It is further said—"And at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." It is not said, all Daniel's people, the Jews, shall be delivered "*at that time*," but only such as were found "*written in the book*." What is meant by being blotted out of a book, or not found written in it, we may learn from Exod. 32: 32, 33. and comp. Rev. 20: 15. On the contrary, what is meant by being found written in a book, may be learned from Phil. 4: 3. and Rev. 13: 8. Comp. Isai. 4: 3. and Luke 10: 20. I shall only quote the following passages, which are a sufficient illustration of this phraseology. "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous," Psalm 69: 28. By consulting this Psalm any one may see, that David referred to the unbelieving Jews, who were the murderers of our Lord, for it is quoted in the New Testament and applied to them. It is implied, that the righteous are written in a book, and it is evident also, that to be blotted out "of the book of the living," or "not to be written with the righteous," are synonymous expressions. Who, then, were the righteous, written in the book, distinguished from the unbelieving Jews not written with the righteous? What persons could they be, but our Lord's disciples? This, in the first place, agrees to the fact, for they were all delivered from the calamities which came on the Jewish nation at the end of the age. They left the city according to our Lord's directions, Matth. 24. and went to a city called Pella, as shown by Macknight on that chapter. Second, It is in agreement with the prediction of Malachi, and the language he uses in reference both to Christ's disciples, and also the unbelieving Jews. Concerning the former, "a book of remembrance was written," chap. 3: 16. and they were spared as a man spareth his only son which serveth him. Con-

cerning the latter, they were to be as stubble. See the description given of them at length in Malachi, chaps. 3, 4. The peculiar phraseology about being written in a book, is in allusion to the ancient practice of making record at courts, of any good service any one had done, as may be seen by consulting Esther 6: 1, 2. and 2: 23. This part of the passage then, perfectly agrees with Scripture, and with the facts of the case.

Let us now attend to verse 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." That no literal resurrection of the dead took place at the destruction of Jerusalem needs no proof, and it has been shown that Daniel refers to this period. What then is the prophet's meaning? The phrase "everlasting life" occurs no where else in the Old Testament. It is a phrase familiar to the New Testament writers, and if borrowed from the Old, must have been taken from this place in Daniel. It could not refer to the happiness of heaven, as people generally suppose, but to that life or happiness enjoyed by the disciples of our Lord, who were found written in the book, as the time and events mentioned verse 1. shows. Besides, it is set in contrast to the shame and everlasting contempt suffered by those not found written in the book, and which came on the Jews in the destruction of their city and temple, and which they are still as a nation enduring. It is obvious, that in Scripture style, life is used to express glory, honor, and happiness, as could easily be shown. At the period referred to, verse 1. many awoke to the honor and happiness of our Lord's kingdom or reign, which consists in righteousness, and peace, and joy in the holy spirit. So did many to the shame and contempt which came on the unbelieving part of the Jewish nation. The term

everlasting is applied to both, and can occasion no difficulty to any one, who has attended to the Old Testament usage of this word, as shown in the preceding Sections. Is it objected—"How could any believer enjoy everlasting life, or any one endure shame and everlasting contempt, if these are confined to this world? Must not both be carried into another world to be everlasting?" We answer this by asking—Must not the children of Israel and the land of Canaan then, be carried into a future state, that they may enjoy this land for "an everlasting possession?" And must not the servant whose ear was pierced, go into another world if he would serve his master forever? And must not Aaron and his sons, with the whole Levitical service, go into another world, that they may enjoy the priesthood forever? In fact, instances without number may be adduced, to show the absurdity of such an objection, and of such a mode of reasoning on the word everlasting.

It is agreeable to fact, that on the day of Pentecost three thousand Jews awoke to the everlasting life imparted by the gospel, by believing in Jesus. Such also was the case with multitudes more of them, as the history of the acts of the Apostles shows. Though the spirit of slumber had seized the Jewish nation, though they had eyes, and saw not, and ears, but heard not, yet the apostle declares that there was a remnant according to the election of grace. See Rom. 11. This part awoke to everlasting life, or entered into the everlasting kingdom of Christ, and had peace and joy in believing. They heard the voice of the son of God and lived. Comp. Eph. 5: 14. The rest slept on till the wrath of God came upon them to the uttermost. They all at last awoke, but it was to shame and everlasting contempt, in being dispersed among all nations, and have become a by-word and a hissing even unto this day. Jeremiah, in chap. 23:

39, 40. predicted this very punishment, and calls it *an everlasting reproach*, and a *perpetual shame*. That the life or happiness enjoyed by believers in the kingdom of Jesus Christ is called *everlasting life* in the New Testament, we shall afterwards show.

After what has been said, we shall only glance at verses 3, 4. "And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." It is a sufficient illustration of this verse to quote our Lord's words, Matth. 13 : 43. "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their father." See on this whole context, Sect. 6. below. Comp. Matth. 24 : 13. and Luke 21 : 28. And is not Dan. 11 : 31—36. descriptive of this very time and events, of the Jews generally, and of our Lord's disciples when God's judgments came on that guilty nation? In the margin of the verse we are considering, it is rendered, "and they that be *teachers* shall shine as the brightness of the firmament." How applicable this was to the apostles and first teachers of Christianity, needs no comment, for the teachers of the seven churches of Asia are called *stars*, Rev. 1 : 20. And who doubts that the apostles and first teachers, shall shine in giving light forever and ever, or as we have seen this phrase explained, "throughout all generations?"

Let us now glance at verse 4. and dismiss this passage. "But thou O! Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book even to the time of the end : many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased." No man, we think, can doubt, that the time of the end, to which Daniel was to shut up the words and seal the book, was the end of the Jewish age or dispensation. The preceding verses show that to this time he did refer, and it is frequently called the end, in the New Testament. See 1 Cor. 10 : 11. Heb. 9 : 26.

and other passages. See particularly Matth. 24 : 3. where the disciples ask our Lord—"What shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world or age." But notice what is said verse 14. to show that many should run to and fro and knowledge should be increased before this end came. "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations ; and then shall the end come." Before the end came, or the destruction of Jerusalem, the sound of the apostles' doctrine had gone out into all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. These things, and many others which I must omit, show, that Daniel here, and our Lord, Matth. 24. speak of the same people, the same time, and the same events. The whole of this passage is illustrated by our Lord's words, John 5 : 28, 29. an explanation of which we have given in the Universalist Magazine, vol. vii. p. 103—7. To it we refer our readers, as our limits forbid its insertion.

Such are all the places in the Old Testament where *olim* is used, in whatever way rendered in the common version, and applied by the sacred writers. Reserving my principal remarks on the use of this word to the last Section, I would only observe here

1st. That though this word is often used in the Old Testament, as my readers have seen, and expresses duration in a variety of ways, yea, is used to express the duration of punishment in a few instances, yet it is not once used to designate any punishment beyond this mortal existence. All the passages where it is applied to punishment have been distinctly noticed, and Dan. 12 : 1—4. has been particularly considered, which is the only text in the Old Testament on which the doctrine of eternal punishment could possibly be built. Our orthodox friends may be ashamed for having made such a mighty noise about their doctrine of eternal misery, and ought to

make a public apology to the world for their conduct. The better informed among them have conceded that this doctrine is not taught in the Old Testament, nor could any of them continue to believe it, if they could only be induced to examine the subject. If any man will be ignorant, let him be ignorant.

2d. If *olim* is so often used in the Old Testament, and is sometimes used to express the duration of punishment, yet is never used to express the duration of punishment beyond this state of existence, when, and how came the doctrine of everlasting punishment after death to be known among men? In the First Part, we have shown its origin to be human. If our orthodox brethren still venture to assert, that its origin is divine, it is their work to show this. Its claims for our belief from the New Testament, I shall now proceed to examine.

SECTION IV.

GENERAL REMARKS ON AION, AND AIONIOS, AS USED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Most Lexicon writers assert, that *aion*, and the adjective *aionios*, are used to express an endless duration of time, though all of them admit, that they are also used to express a limited period. From this very fact has arisen long and violent contentions, whether these words, when used to express the duration of punishment, are to be understood in a limited or unlimited sense. Lexicons are not infallible,

nor were they intended to determine, but only to assist us in ascertaining the true meaning of Scripture words. The words were used and understood long before Lexicons had any existence. Whilst we ought to avail ourselves of their assistance, yet every man ought to examine for himself, from their general usage, the context of the places, and other circumstances, if the senses of words given by them be correct. To receive implicitly what they say, is only to perpetuate their errors, if the writers have inadvertently or intentionally committed any.

It is universally allowed, by all competent judges, of whatever sect, that *aion* and *aionios* are frequently used to express a limited duration of time. Parkhurst says, *aion* "denotes *duration* or *continuance of time*, but with great variety." Ewing says it signifies "*duration, finite, or infinite; a period of duration, past, or future; an age, duration of the world*, Deut. 32: 7. Luke 1: 70. plural, *ages of the world*, 1 Cor. 2: 7. hence *human life in this world*, Luke 16: 8. or *the next*, Mark 10: 30. *our manner of life in the world*, Psalm 90: 8. Eph. 2: 2. *an age of divine dispensation, the ages*, generally reckoned three; that before the law, that under the law, and that under the Messiah, Matth. 24: 3. and 28: 20. 1 Cor. 10: 11. Heb. 11: 3. by faith we understand, *κατηγισθαι τους αιωνας ρηματι Θεου*, that the ages were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are (now) seen, did not arise out of things which did (previously) appear, comp. verses 1. 7. 26. 27. *an indefinitely long period of time; hence eternity*; Exod. 14: 13. Luke 1: 55. John 4: 14. Psalm 19: 9. Gal. 1: 5. Rev. 20: 10. from eternity to eternity, 1 Chron. 29: 10. Psalm 90: 2." On the word *aionios*, Ewing says, it signifies "*eternal*, Exod. 3: 14, 15. Matth. 25: 46. Rom. 16: 26. *chronoi aionoi*, ages of the world, periods of the dispensations since the world began, Rom. 16:

25." See Parkhurst for a similar explanation, but let the reader examine their proofs.

The word *aion* is compounded of *aei*, always; and *on*, being; which is interpreted by Parkhurst and others, "always being." Yet he says, "*it denotes duration, or continuance of time, but with great variety!*" He allows that *aei*, always, signifies "*ever* in a restrained sense, that is, at some stated times, very frequently, continually." Acts 7 : 51. and 2 Cor. 6 : 10. to which he refers as proof of its meaning *ever* in an unrestrained sense, do not prove his point, for surely the Jews did not eternally resist the Spirit of God, nor did the apostle mean that he rejoiced eternally. Its sense seems evidently to be *perseveringly*, but not endless in duration. Had Parkhurst found any texts more to his purpose, no doubt but he would have quoted them. All the texts where he thinks *aion* means a proper eternity will be considered in their place.

It is a remark, which has often been made, that the adjective *aionios* cannot signify more than the noun from whence it is derived, for, if the latter only expresses limited duration, the former cannot express endless. A stream cannot rise higher than its fountain without mechanical force, nor can *aionios* express a longer duration than *aion*, without a forced construction of meaning. Though Parkhurst asserts, that it means "eternal, having neither beginning nor end," yet he allows that it signifies "*the ages of the world, the times since the beginning of its existence.*" And adds—"the Seventy frequently use this adjective for the Hebrew *oulem*." But from an examination of the texts in the Old Testament where this word occurs, the reader can judge for himself, if any thing conclusive can be drawn from it as to its expressing endless duration. From an examination of all the texts where it is used to express the duration of punishment, we

think it proved, that it does not express endless duration, nor does it even refer to punishment in a future state of existence. Whether *aionios*, its corresponding word in the New, does this, we shall see when we come to consider the passages in which it occurs. If it did, the one word certainly does not correspond to the other, for there is an inconceivable difference between limited and endless duration. All this difference is added by the New Testament writers to the word *aionios*, if it expresses the eternity of punishment. It has been said, that *aionios* when it stands alone, signifies duration without end. But how can it stand alone? For if an adjective, it must have some noun, either expressed or understood, with which it is connected, and which it qualifies. If a man should say—"eternal," the question would immediately be asked him, eternal what? If he meant to be understood, he would inform us what thing he considered to be eternal; such as—eternal God, eternal life, eternal punishment. It is the noun then, or the thing to which this word is applied, which must determine the extent of duration expressed by it; and if *aion*, from which it is derived, does not express endless duration, but an age, how can the adjective express a longer duration, unless we say the word derived contains more than that from which it is derived, or the stream contains more, or rises higher than the fountain? Allowing it to be applied to God, who is without beginning or end, what does this prove? Can this make God so, or does it fix the meaning of this word as expressing endless duration? Not unless we say words expressing a limited time cannot possibly be applied to him: or if applied, must derive an unlimited, yea, infinite sense from such an application. Our orthodox friends would not reason so in other cases. The terms *good* and *great* are adjectives, and are applied to God. But do

they contend that they are to be always understood in an infinite sense, or expressing an infinite degree when so applied? Surely not, for how could they in this case maintain their doctrine of infinite, endless misery? Seeing it is said, "the Lord is good unto all," and that "*great* is his mercy."

But again, the words are used in the plural number. But how can words capable of being used plurally signify a proper eternity? For eternity is one. Eternities are never spoken of. People speak of eternity to come, and eternity past, but still it is only one uninterrupted endless continuance. The past eternity had no beginning, nor had it an end when the future eternity began, for in this view it could not be a proper eternity as it had an end. In fact we cannot form a distinct, definite idea of eternity, for if this could be done, we must either be infinite ourselves or necessarily limit it.

In our English version I find *aion* rendered seven times never, once course, twice ages, thirty-seven times world, once without end, once eternal, twice ever, sixty-six times forever, and four times for evermore. In several places it occurs twice in the same text. The adjective *aionios* I find is rendered three times *world*, once *forever*, forty-one times *eternal*, and twenty-four times *everlasting*. As forever, eternal and everlasting, are English words which convey the same idea it is unnecessary to make any distinction in introducing the passages where they occur, whether the translation of *aion* or *aionios*. In rendering *aion* and *aionios* in the New Testament, our translators have given us considerable variety as they did in rendering *olim* in the Old Testament. In only two instances however, have they rendered them by the word *age* or *ages*. But many translations of the New Testament have been made since, where *age* is given as a better rendering of these words. It is, I believe,

now generally agreed by critics and commentators, both *orthodox* and *otherwise*, that *age* ought to be the rendering of this word in a variety of places, some of which shall be noticed in their place.

It is universally allowed, that *aion* and *aionios* are the words used in the Seventy's version in rendering the Hebrew word *olam*. A very slight inspection of this version will satisfy any one of its truth. It is well known that our Lord and his apostles quoted the Seventy's version. And Mr. Stuart observes that although 'the New Testament was written in Greek yet its idiom is Hebrew.' He calls it 'the Hebrew Greek of the New Testament.' Indeed the longer I study the two Testaments I am the more convinced, that in understanding the phraseology of the New, we must recur to the Old Testament for our explanations. The translators of our common version, have rendered these Hebrew and Greek words generally by the same English words, such as, world, everlasting, eternal, forever, and forever and ever. This is the case, whether the words are applied to God, or to punishment in the Old or New Testaments, nor is it intimated that the original words, or the words by which they are rendered, have a more vague and indefinite meaning in the former than they have in the latter. To an English reader, everlasting and forever are the same in both Testaments. If everlasting punishment is not taught in the Old Testament, it is not for want of as definite a word to express it, as is found in the New.

It is admitted by some that the Old Testament is silent on the subject of everlasting punishment, yet they contend that it is taught in the New, and that *aion* and *aionios* are the words used to express its duration. But why admit the former and contend for the latter? In both Testaments punishment is mentioned, and in both everlasting and forever are

applied to it. If it is found in one it ought to be found in both. Is it rational to suppose, that a doctrine of so much importance should be concealed for so many ages? How can this be reconciled with the divine character? Was this the mystery which was kept hid from ages, and from generations, but is now revealed to us by the apostles? No New Testament writer intimates, that punishment under the old dispensation was only temporary in its duration, but under the new, was endless. All the Scripture writers speak of punishment in the same way, express its duration in similar language, nor would their readers suppose that the New Testament writers were believers in endless misery, and those of the Old not. It is generally allowed that the punishments threatened under the Old Testament were all of a temporal nature. The question may then be asked, whether this is not a mistaken view of the Old Testament punishments? That it is not, seems obvious from all the instances mentioned, and also from no other kind of punishment being recognized in the New, when the punishments under that dispensation are referred to. The New Testament, like the Old, speaks frequently of punishment. It will then be necessary to examine with care, all the texts in the New, where *aion* and *aionios* are rendered eternal, everlasting, or forever, and applied to punishment. Is it not possible that men may have been mistaken in affirming, that the punishments under the Christian dispensation are carried beyond death, and are of endless duration? May they not be temporal, as under the Mosaic dispensation, and why cannot the words eternal, everlasting, or forever, be applied to them, yet not endless in duration, just as well as to those under that dispensation? Christians do not seem to think of any punishment in this life for disobedience to God. No; it is all carried into a future state of existence, and

considered to be endless. But surely the New Testament writers speak of punishments, and very awful punishments in this life. Nor do they say, that under the new dispensation *an eternal punishment awaited any in a future state of existence, but did not under the old dispensation.* The places in the New Testament, where the words eternal, everlasting, or forever, are applied to punishment, are few in number. If they were even many, what could this certainly prove, for we have seen such words applied to *things*, and even to *punishment of persons*, under the former dispensation, where all allow endless duration was not expressed by them?

It has been asserted, that the truth or falsehood of the doctrine of endless misery, depends on the meaning of *aion* and *aionios* in the New Testament, and that this subject was reduced to a matter of verbal criticism. But why ought not its truth to depend as much on the meaning of *olim* in the Old Testament, which is rendered everlasting and forever, as those words are in the New? It is a capricious mode of interpretation, to give this language a limited signification in the one case and not in the other also. The truth is, something besides the mere application of the word everlasting to punishment, must appear, to prove it of endless duration, for no man can deny, that it is applied to punishment when no one thinks endless duration was meant. Besides, the word *everlasting* being so frequently applied to *temporary* things, shows, that no great dependence is to be placed on such an argument.

One of the most plausible arguments arising from everlasting being applied to punishment in the New Testament is, that in Matth. 25: 46. the same original word is applied both to life and punishment, and that if the one is not endless neither is the other. But permit me here only to remark—Why does not this

equally apply to Dan. 12: 2. where a case of the same kind is found? We have there shown that everlasting does not refer to endless duration of either happiness or punishment, or to any thing beyond this state of existence. When we come to consider Matth. 25: 46. we shall see that this is a comment on Dan. 12: 2. and that both refer to the same everlasting punishment and happiness.

When people end the Old Testament they seem to forget that the New is the revelation of the same God addressed originally to the Jews; that it was written by Jews, and that its ideas and language are borrowed from Moses and the prophets. The writers adopt the words, phrases, and idioms used in the Old Testament, as well as quote formally from it. Dr. Campbell assures us that our Lord and his apostles spoke to the Jews in the dialect of their own Scriptures, and used words and phrases with which they were familiar. And Mr. Stuart calls their writings the Hebrew Greek of the New Testament. If we would understand this book, we must not sit down to it as Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists or Universalists, but as Jews. The question is not, what sense do any of these sects put on the words, phrases, and idioms which are found in it, but in what sense were they understood among Jews from their own Scriptures. Is it asked—How are we to know this? I answer, from the Old Testament, from whence the New Testament writers borrowed them. The Old Testament is our dictionary of the language of the New, for the writers spake, not in the words which man teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth. While the New Testament is interpreted by sectarian dictionaries, how can Christians ever come to be agreed? Can any thing else be expected but bitter contentions among them? The meaning and extent of the words and phrases to come before us

were well understood among the Jews. It is to be no concern of mine, how any sect now understands them, nor how I have formerly understood them myself, but how were they understood by the Jews, or what is their current sense in their sacred books. I am to consider myself, and the reader ought to consider himself, as living eighteen hundred years ago, as being born and brought up a Jew; as familiar with the Old Testament; habituated to words, phrases, and idioms of language common among the Jews; and in fact, as far as possible to enter into the feelings, habits of thinking, and even the prejudices of that wonderful people.

New Testament usage of a word or phrase, is another very important rule of which we shall avail ourselves in interpreting the passages which shall be brought before us. For example, in Matth. 24: 3. we have the phrase *the end of the world*. Now, if this phrase does not mean here the end of this natural world, but the end of the Jewish age, we think it ought to have the same meaning in other places, unless the subject and scope of the writer entirely forbids it. When I therefore come to this phrase, or others in the course of this investigation, all the places in which such phrases are found, will be brought forward at once and considered. This will save repetition of remark, and will enable the reader to form a more correct judgment of the true Scripture meaning of such phrases. Besides, if any inspired writer uses a word or phrase, and its sense is ascertained, if he uses it again, or repeatedly, it ought to be understood in the same sense, unless he by some way shows us he is to be differently understood. This is nothing more than every writer or speaker is entitled to, whom we wish to treat with common civility. If he uses it in another book, or if

it is used by other sacred writers, our means of ascertaining its true sense are increased.

Much misunderstanding of the Scriptures has arisen from our overlooking what some may think but trifling circumstances. For example, some seldom take into view the writer, the time when he wrote, or the circumstances in which he was placed. They also overlook the persons to whom he addressed himself, the circumstances in which they were placed, and the subject on which he discourses to them. The scope and drift of his discourse from the context, is seldom considered. Hence words, phrases, and verses are quoted, to prove what was never thought of by him. His words are quoted, and a sense affixed to them agreeable to the religious creeds of the persons, which, if the context was but consulted, would show them their mistake, and that, though unintentionally, they were perverting the Scriptures. We also may err, and fail in what we propose, but we shall at least make the attempt. Infallibility is no article of our creed; we would only do all in our power to produce a correct understanding of the Scriptures, without which, endless division and debate must exist among Christians.

SECTION V.

ALL THE PLACES NOTICED WHERE AION AND AIONIOS ARE RENDERED AGES, COURSE, NEVER, FOREVER, EVERMORE, ETERNAL, EVERLASTING ; BUT WHICH HAVE NO RELATION TO PUNISHMENT.

THE word *aion* is rendered ages, in the common version, in the following places. Eph. 2 : 7. "That in the *ages* to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace." It would have been absurd to have rendered it here, "that in the *eternities* to come." Nor would it have sounded well to have said, "that in the *worlds* to come," for the question might have been asked, Pray how many eternities or worlds are to come? Our translators, then, not only own that this word signifies age, but were compelled to render it so in this passage. Again, Col. 1 : 26. "Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations." The remarks on the last text equally apply here. It would not have done to have said, "even the mystery which hath been hid from *generations*," for the term generations is used immediately after in the passage. Macknight on this text, says, "'The mystery which was kept hid from the ages and from the generations.'" In the parallel passage, Eph. 3 : 5. it is, 'which in other generations was not made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles.' So likewise Romans 16 : 25. 'the mystery which hath been kept secret,' *ἡ κρυβημένη ἀποκάλυψις, in the times of the ages, or during the Mosaic dispensation.* For the meaning of the words

mystery, and *ages*, see Eph. 1 : 9. Tit. 1 : 2. notes. Though the salvation of mankind by faith, was promised in the covenant with Abraham, and spoken of by the prophets, it was not understood by the Jews, see Eph. 3 : 5. note, and therefore it is here called a *mystery*, or thing kept secret, in allusion to the heathen mysteries."

I shall also quote the following from Pierce, on this passage, as it sheds general light on this whole subject. "'The mystery which hath been hid from ages and generations.' The expression of το μυστηριον το αποκεκρυμμενον απο των αιωνων, is rendered by our translators, Eph. 3 : 9. *the mystery hid from the beginning of the world*; but it is manifest from this place, where it is joined with απο των γενεων, that it is rightly translated here *hid from ages*, and that it ought to have been so translated in that place also. The same thing is meant when he speaks of the *revelation of the mystery*, χρονοις αιωνοις σεσχημενεν, which we translate, *kept secret since the world began*; but Mr. Locke better renders it *in the secular times*, that is, the times under the law. I shall here transcribe his remark upon the words, Rom. 16 : 25. because it gives much light to this matter. 'Why the times under the law were called χρονοι αιωνοι, we may find a reason in their *jubilees*, which were αιωνες, *seacula*, or *ages*, by which all the time under the law was measured : and so χρονον αιωνων is used, 2 Tim. 1 : 9. Tit. 1 : 2. And so αιωνες are put for the times of the law, or the *jubilees*, Luke 1 : 70. Acts 3 : 21. 1 Cor. 2 : 7. 10 : 11. Eph. 3 : 9. Col. 1 : 26. Heb. 9 : 26. And so God is called *the rock*, לְרוֹם עַל אֵינֶן αιωνων, *of ages*, Isai. 26 : 4. in the same sense that he is called the *rock* of Israel, Isai. 30 : 29. *i.e.* the strength and support of the Jewish state; for it is of the Jews the prophet here speaks. So Exod. 21 : 6. לְעוֹלָם εις των αιωνα, signifies not as we translate it, *forever*, but to the *jubilee*; which will appear if we

compare Lev. 25 : 39—41. and Exod. 21 : 2. Now that the times of the law were the times spoken of here by St. Paul, seems plain from that which he declares to have continued a mystery during all those times, *viz.* God's purpose of taking in the Gentiles to be his people under the Messiah ; for this could not be said to be a mystery at any other time, but during the time that the Jews were the peculiar people of God, separated to him from among the nations of the earth. Before that time there was no such name or notion of distinction, as Gentiles. Before the days of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the calling of the Israelites to be God's peculiar people, was as much a mystery, as the calling of others out of other nations was a mystery afterwards. All that St. Paul insists on here, and in all the places where he mentions this mystery is to show, that though God had declared this his purpose to the Jews, by the predictions of his prophets among them, yet it lay concealed from their knowledge, it was a mystery to them, they understood no such thing ; there was not any where the least suspicion or thought of it, till the Messiah being come, it was declared by St. Paul to the Jews, and Gentiles, and made out by the writings of the prophets which were now understood."

Aion is rendered *course*, Ephes. 2 : 2. "Wherein in time past, ye walked according to the course of this world." Macknight says, "Chandler observes that the Greek word *aion*, and the Latin *avum*, which corresponds to it, signify the life of man ; and by an easy figure, the manner of a man's living." That *olim*, in the Old Testament, often signifies a man's lifetime, has been seen above. And *aionion* signifies the lifetime of Onesimus, Phile. 15. See Macknight on this verse.

The Greek phrase *eis ton aiona*, occurs in the following texts, and is rendered in our version *never*. John 4 : 14. "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst." And 8 : 51.

"If a man keep my saying he shall never see death." See also verse 52. In chap. 10: 28. it is said, "they shall never perish," referring to Christ's sheep. And 11: 26. "whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." And 13: 8. Peter said to Jesus—"thou shalt never wash my feet." Dr. Campbell in his note on John 9: 32. says, concerning the phrases *ek tou aionos* and *eis ton aiona*, "but in popular language, the former often denotes no more than from the beginning of the world, or even from very early times; and *eis ton aiona* does not always mean to eternity, in the strict sense of the word. That the use is nearly the same in the Pagan writers, has been very well shown by Wetstein."

The same Greek phrase *eis ton aiona*, is rendered in the following passages *forever*. In Matth. 21: 19. it is said of the fig-tree, "let no fruit grow on thee henceforward *forever*." See also Mark 11: 14. In Luke 1: 55. it is said, "as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed *forever*." And John 6: 51. "If any man eat of this bread he shall live *forever*." See also verse 58. And 8: 35. "And the servant abideth not in the house *forever*; but the son abideth *ever*." John 12: 34. "We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth *forever*." And 14: 16. "He shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you *forever*." Heb. 5: 6. "Thou art a priest *forever*, after the order of Melchisedec." And 6: 20. and 7: 17, 21. where the same is repeated. Verse 24. "But this man, because he continueth *ever*, hath an unchangeable priesthood." Verse 28. "but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the son who is consecrated for *evermore*." 1 Peter 1: 23. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed but incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth *forever*." And 1 John 2: 17. "But he that doeth the will of God abideth *forever*."

And 2 John 2. "for the truth's sake which dwelleth in us, and shall be with us forever." See some other texts below, where this phrase is differently rendered, and is used to express the duration of punishment.

On all these texts, where this phrase, *eis ton aiona*, occurs, we would remark, that it is used in a similar sense as *olim* in the Old Testament, where it is said of certain cities, that they should be an heap, or a desolation forever; such as the example of the fig-tree, which passage Dr. Campbell renders—"let no fruit grow on thee henceforward." It is also used to express the period of a man's lifetime, as in the Old Testament. The servant or slave may be sold, or the year of release may set him free, but the son abideth forever, or all his days. And whoever compares John 14: 16. with verses 1—5. and with verse 12. may see reason to think that our Lord's meaning was—the comforter I shall send you will not, like me, leave you before you die, but will continue to be with you all your days. Was not this the way Christ was to fulfil his promise, Matth. 28: 20. in being with his disciples unto the end of the world or age? See on this text below. Besides, when Paul said he would eat no flesh while the world standeth, did he mean any thing more than all the days of his life? In this sense Macknight understands him. I would merely suggest it for consideration, if his meaning is not, I will eat no flesh while the age or Jewish dispensation endures, which was then vanishing away. I should think the above Greek phrase, is also used as in the Old Testament, to signify throughout your generations. Such seems to be its sense in Luke 1: 55. and also where the word of the Lord is said to endure forever, 1 Peter 1: 23, 25. and comp. Heb. 9: 14. But to see what is the meaning of the phrase, see the Seventy's version, from whence it is taken. *Eis ton*

aiona is the rendering there of *olim* in a vast number of instances, which it would be tedious to enumerate. See the quotation from Pierce, on Col. 1 : 26. above.

The phrase, *eis tous aionas*, is used in the following places, and is rendered forever and for evermore. Matth. 6 : 13. "for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever." Luke 1 : 33. "And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever." Rom. 1 : 25. "and served the creature more than the creator, who is blessed forever." Rom. 9 : 5. "who is over all God blessed forever." And 11 : 36. "to whom be glory forever." And 16 : 27. "to God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ forever." 2 Cor. 11 : 31. "the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ who is blessed for evermore." Heb. 13 : 8. "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." Comp. 1 Tim. 6 : 16. In the following texts, the phrase *eis tous aionas* occurs, and is joined with *ton aionon*, and rendered "*forever and ever*," in ascriptions of praise to God and to Christ. Thus for example, Gal. 1 : 5. "to whom be glory forever and ever." The same for substance is repeated in the following texts, which it is unnecessary to quote. Philip. 4 : 20. 2 Tim. 4 : 18. Heb. 13 : 21. 1 Peter 4 : 11. and 5 : 11. Rev. 1 : 6, 18. 4 : 9, 10. 5 : 13, 14. 7 : 12. 10 : 6. 11 : 15. 14 : 11. 15 : 7. 19 : 3. 20 : 10. and 22 : 5. It occurs also in 1 Tim. 1 : 17. in an ascription of praise to God, which I shall quote, as it requires some notice. "Now unto the king eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever." When God is here said to be *the king eternal*, most people think the apostle meant to describe the endless duration of the divine being. But on this text let us hear Macknight, who thus writes. "*Now to the king eternal*. Perhaps, *ὁ δε βασιλει των αιωνων*, may be better translated, *to the king of the ages*, namely, the age before the law, the

age under the law, and the age under the Messiah. According to this translation, which is perfectly literal, the apostle's meaning is, To him who hath governed the three dispensations under which mankind have lived, so as to make them cooperate to the same great end, the pardoning of sinners, and who is immortal, &c. be honor, and glory forever, ascribed by angels and men." There is no cause for alarm with good people, that these views are attempting to do away the eternal duration of God, for surely his endless existence is independent of the meaning of a Greek word, whether you give it a limited or an unlimited signification. Besides, in this very passage he is called the "immortal (*aftharto*) God." In some copies it is the *athanato*, or undying God. No one can doubt that Macknight's rendering is a literal, correct one. The apostle is then rendering praise to God, who is king throughout all the ages, that before the law, under the law, and the age also of the Messiah. This king purposed an eternal purpose, Eph. 3: 11. which Macknight thus renders, "according to the disposition of the ages, which he made for Christ Jesus our Lord." See his whole note on Eph. 3: 11. part of which I shall only quote. '*Αἰών*, *age*, is a word of various signification. Here, in the plural, it denotes the dispensations of religion under which mankind have been placed; namely the *Patriarchal*, in which a Saviour was promised; the *Mosaical*, in which he was typified; and the *Christian*, in which he was manifested in the flesh, and preached to the world, as come. All these *ages* or dispensations, the apostle saith, God planned and brought to pass for the sake of Christ Jesus; that is to prepare mankind for his reception.—Rom. 16: 25. Tit. 1: 2. (see the note on that verse,) *χρόνοι αἰώνιοι*, signifies the ages of the law, or Mosaic dispensation. And Eph. 3: 9.

Col. 1 : 26. *now*, signifies *the Jews*, living under that dispensation."

There are a few more texts, in which the words everlasting and eternal occur, to which we shall now pay some attention, in connexion with these quotations. When God is called the king of the ages, the question occurs—What ages? According to Ewing and others, the answer is, the age before the law, the Mosaic age, and the age of the Messiah. The king of the ages then, disposed, or appointed the ages, for Christ Jesus. Before the Mosaic age, a promise of life was given in Christ Jesus, Tit. 1 : 2. This we shall see more fully afterwards. It was promised to our first parents; also to Abraham, that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed. This was done during the patriarchal age. During the Mosaic age, the law was added to the promise until the seed should come. Many things connected with this dispensation, we have seen, were called everlasting, but having answered the purpose for which they were added to the promise, have vanished away. The age of the Messiah succeeded it, but it is to be succeeded by no other. When the end of it comes, Christ is to deliver up the kingdom to God the father, which appears to be at the resurrection of the dead. 1 Cor. 15 : 24—29. Several things during the reign or kingdom of Messiah in this age, is called everlasting or forever. His kingdom is called "*the everlasting kingdom* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," 2 Peter 1 : 11. And surely it may be called so, with more propriety than many things under the Mosaic age or dispensation, for this kingdom is not to be superseded by another taking its place, for when it closes it is said—"then cometh the end."

The gospel of the kingdom of the Messiah, is called "*the everlasting gospel* preached to the nations," Rev. 14 : 6. And why is it called everlasting? Be-

cause it shall be preached as long as the kingdom of the Messiah shall continue, which shall be to the period called *the end*. Hence it is said, the word of the Lord endureth forever, 1 Peter 1: 23. And Christ promised that the spirit or comforter should abide with his disciples forever, and is called the *eternal spirit*, Heb. 9: 14. Some copies, however, only read *holy spirit*. Such as believe the everlasting gospel, and enter into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, receive *everlasting consolation* and good hope through grace, 2 Thess. 2: 16. Or, as Macknight says—"that is, the means of never failing consolation." To be so highly honored is thus expressed by Peter, 1st. Epistle 5: 10. "The God of all grace, who hath called us unto his *eternal glory* by Christ Jesus." Let it be observed, that eternal glory is not said to be a future thing, but that to which Peter says they were already called. They receive the promise of *eternal inheritance*, Heb. 9: 15. If the land of Canaan was given to Israel, and called an everlasting inheritance, as it often is in the Old Testament, how much more might the inheritance in the kingdom of Jesus Christ bestowed on Christians, be called an eternal inheritance? It should be recollected, that the apostle was writing to Hebrews, to whom such language was familiar. Besides, this, we shall afterwards see, is the same that our Lord calls enjoying eternal life in *the world to come*. And is it not the same that Paul calls inheriting the kingdom of God and of Christ, 1 Cor. 6: 9, 10. Gal. 5: 21?

The new covenant, like the covenants under the Mosaic age, is called the everlasting covenant. And surely it may be called so, for it is not to vanish away, and give place to a new and better covenant, like that of the old. Christ's blood was that by which this new covenant was confirmed, and is called the *blood of the everlasting covenant*, Heb. 13: 20. Having purg-

his people, not as under the law with the blood of goats and calves, "but by his own blood, he entered once unto the holy place, having obtained *eternal redemption*," Heb. 9 : 12. "And being made perfect through suffering, became the author of *eternal salvation* to all them that obey him," Heb. 5 : 9. Christ's salvation is called a great salvation, Heb. 2 : 3. probably in reference to other salvations which God wrought for ancient Israel. And here it is called *eternal* in the same comparative sense, for God wrought many salvations for them. This salvation was abiding. Comp. Luke 1 : 74, 75. Is it asked—Salvation from what? I answer, not from hell and endless misery, for this is nowhere said in Scripture, but from sin and death, which Christ shall finally accomplish. See 1 Cor. 15.

In 2 Peter 3 : 18. we have the following ascription of praise. "To whom be glory both now and forever." The Greek here is *eis hemeran aionos*. Macknight says this is "unto the day of eternity." But how can this be, for what has eternity to do with days? Besides, how does this agree to some quotations made from him respecting *aion*, which he says means an age. We should say the text simply says "to him be glory both now and unto the day of ages." Some copies have it, "unto the age of ages," similar to passages noticed above. We should mark the duration expressed is "during the age of the Messiah." Luke 16 : 9. "That when ye fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations." Dr. Campbell says, "the epithet *unrighteous*, here applied to mammon or riches, does not imply acquired by injustice or any undue means; but, in this application, denotes *false riches*, that is, *deceitful*, not to be relied on." Well, does not the epithet *everlasting*, applied to habitations, mean stable and satisfactory? See Psalm 49 : 11. and 2 Thess. 2 : 16. and other

texts above. But as it is applied, not to punishment, but to happiness, it requires no further attention.

2 Cor. 4 : 17, 18. and 5 : 1. I shall quote together. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory ; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen : for the things which are seen are temporal ; but the things which are not seen are eternal. For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." In these verses, *glory* is contrasted with *affliction*, *weight of glory* with *light affliction*, and *a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory*, with *affliction which is but for a moment*. Besides, things which *are not seen*, are contrasted with things which *are seen*, and the *eternal duration* of things not seen, with the *temporary duration* of things which are seen ; and an *house not made with hands*, is contrasted with *the house of this tabernacle*, and the house not made with hands *eternal in the heavens* with the *earthly* house of this tabernacle. But notice, the duration of these things is said to be *in the heavens*, and we think could be shown from the context, to refer to that state of things after the resurrection, when mortality is swallowed up of life, verse 4. See the whole context, and a paper in volume 7. of the Universalist Magazine on verse 10. The idea conveyed by the word *eternal* in all these verses, seems to be the stability of the things of that state compared to those of the present. Though the idea of their endless duration is included, yet the apostle's object seems to be more their *stability* than their *endless duration*. But as these passages have no relation to punishment, it is unnecessary to enter into further remarks, except to say, that the same or similar things

are not said in regard to the punishment of any after the dissolution of their earthly tabernacle. This we shall see in Section 7. where all the passages are considered where eternal is applied to punishment.

SECTION VI.

ALL THE PLACES WHERE AION AND AIONIOS ARE RENDERED
WORLD, CONSIDERED.

I FIND the Greek phrase, *eis ton aiona*, rendered world, 1 Cor. 8: 13. "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth." Here the same Greek phrase is rendered world, which we have seen, is rendered never, forever, and for evermore. And why is it so rendered here? Because, it would not do to say—"I will eat no flesh while the never, forever, or everlasting standeth." It is plain that this phrase did not express endless duration by the sacred writers.

In Heb. 1: 2. and 11: 3. we have the phrase *tous aionas*, and is rendered worlds. "By whom also he made the worlds. Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God." On the first of these texts Pierce says. "If we render the words by *whom also he appointed the ages*, the sense will fall in with Eph. 3: 11. See Mr. Locke upon that verse." See on this passage in the last Section. On the second, Macknight says it is literally,—"secula,

the ages." Ewing renders it, "By faith we understand the ages were framed by the word of God." Those ages, he says, were reckoned three—"that before the law, that under the law, and that under the Messiah."

Eph. 3: 21. "Unto him be glory in the church, by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end." The Greek here is *eis pasas tas geneas tou aionos ton aionon*. Macknight says this phrase literally is—"throughout all the generations of the age of ages." Is a proper eternity measured by generations? Surely not. By the age of ages seems to be meant the duration of Messiah's reign, or until he delivers up the kingdom to God the father, 1 Cor. 15: 24—28. Until then, God is to be glorified in the church by Christ Jesus. I would suggest it for consideration—Is not the age of the Messiah called the age of ages in a similar sense as he is called "king of kings and Lord of Lords?" The age of the Messiah was that for which all the others were constituted, shall continue throughout all the generations of this world, and is to be superseded by no other, like the ages which have preceded it.

The word *aion* is not only rendered world, but we read both of the *beginning* and *end* of the world or age; the one class precisely answering to the other. Let us first notice the texts which speak of the *beginning* of the age or world. Eph. 3: 9. "And to make all men see, what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." Wakefield renders it thus, "was hidden from the ages in God." Macknight in his note on this text says, "Hid from the ages. So the original phrase *apo ton aionon* ought to be translated, as is plain from Col. 1: 26. where generations are also mentioned." To render *aion* here by any word implying endless

duration, would make the apostle speak of the beginning of the everlasting or eternal duration, which would be a contradiction in terms. Tit. 1: 2. "In hope of eternal life, which God that cannot lie, promised before the world began." Wakefield renders it "promised before the ages." Macknight, on this text, says, "*Before the times of the ages.* Πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων. Supposing that the word αἰώνιος in this clause to signify *eternal*, the literal translation of the passage would be, *before eternal times*. But that being a contradiction in terms, our translators, contrary to the propriety of the Greek language, have rendered it—*before the world began*. As Locke observes on Rom. 16: 25. the true literal translation is, *before the secular times*; referring us to the Jewish jubilees, by which times were computed among the Hebrews: as among the Gentiles they were computed by *generations of men*. Hence Col. 1: 26. *The mystery which was kept hid, ἀπο τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπο τῶν γενεῶν* from the ages and from the generations, signifies the mystery which was kept hid from the Jews and from the Gentiles. See this explained Rom. 16: 25. note 3." Whitby's note is for substance the same. Did God promise eternal life before the everlasting or the eternity began? The same or similar remarks apply to Rom. 16: 25. "According to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began." Wakefield renders it—"which was kept secret from the ages of old." See Macknight on Rom. 16: 25. Luke 1: 70. "As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began." Permit me to ask—Has God spoken by his holy prophets which have been since the everlasting or eternity began? Who believes eternity has a beginning? Accordingly, Wakefield renders it "from the first." In his note he says, "*ap aionos*" signifies "*or of old*, literally, from the age." Dr. Campbell renders it—"as

anciently he promised by his holy prophets;" and Whitby, "from the beginning of ages." Acts 3 : 21. "Which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." The Greek phrase is the same here as in the last text, and is rendered in the same way, and the same remarks apply to it, and need not be repeated. See Macknight on Romans 16 : 25. In Acts 15 : 18. The Greek is the same as in the last text, which saves all labor of transcribing or remarks. John 9 : 32. "Since the world began was it not heard, that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind." Wakefield renders it, "never was it heard yet;" and Dr. Campbell has it, "never was it heard before." See on preceding texts. 2 Tim. 1 : 9. "Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the world began." The Greek phrase here is *pro hronon aionion*, which Wakefield renders "before the age." Whitby, "before any age hath passed." Macknight, "before the times of the ages." See his note quoted on Tit. 1 : 2. above. 1 Cor. 2 : 7. "But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory." The Greek here is *pro ton aionon*. Macknight renders it, "before the ages." He understands it, "before the Mosaic dispensation." See his notes on Rom. 16 : 25. Eph. 3 : 9. and Col. 1 : 26. above.

Such are all the places where the phrases, the beginning of the world—from the beginning of the world—before the world—and since the world began, occur. On the whole of them I would remark, 1st. That in none of them is there any reference, as many suppose, to this material world, or its beginning. The word *aion* rendered *world*, signifies, by the consent of the above critics, and others which

might be quoted, simply *age*. Since the world began, is, since the age began. Before the world, signifies before the age, and from the beginning of the world, means from the beginning of the age. If it be asked, what age? The answer is, the age or dispensation of the law of Moses. If this be true, and it is indisputable, all must see what a great change it makes in the sense of all the above passages. Besides, it deeply affects the sense of many others, and affords a key to the understanding of some, which we shall presently notice. So far from *aion* signifying this *material world*, the above critics have shown, that our translators, contrary to the propriety of the Greek language, have rendered Tit. 2: 2. *before the world began*, which remark applies equally to the other passages. They have shown, that it refers to the dispensation of the law of Moses, which, as Locke observes, is called *aion*, the age, Luke 1: 70. Acts 3: 21. And *chronos aionioi*, because, under the law, time was measured by ages or jubilees. See all the above quotations. 2d. The Greek word for this *material world*, is *kosmos*, and not *aion*. And the Greek phrase for “before the world,” meaning this material world, is, *pro tou ton kosmon*. See John 17: 5. Besides, where it is used it is never contrasted with *aion*. For example, the beginning of the *kosmos*, world, is never contrasted with the end of the *aion*, or age, nor, the beginning of the *aion*, age, contrasted with the end of the *kosmos*, world. 3d. Every person must perceive the absurdity of rendering *aion* in any of the above texts, by any English word which conveys the idea of endless duration. Were it done, we should read of the beginning of the everlasting, or forever, and of things which were done before the everlasting or forever began; yea, of things which God ordained before the everlasting or forever. Let any one go over all those passages, and he cannot help being convinced,

that the sacred writers attached no such idea to this word. Are not men very much to blame then, in being so very confident, that *aion* expresses the endless duration of punishment? By the general consent of critics and commentators, yea, by the very scope of the above passages, *aion* signifies age. We ought not then very hastily to abandon this as its meaning in other places, unless it is certainly shown, that this cannot be its sense, but that it means endless duration.

Let us now pay attention to another class of texts, which speak of the *end of the world or age*, and correspond to the above, which speak of the *beginning of the world or age*. This is nothing more than might be expected, unless the Jewish age or dispensation was to be of endless duration. Matth. 24 : 3. "Tell us, when shall these things be? And what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" The Greek phrase here for "the end of the world," is *sunteleia tou aionos*. Dr. Campbell renders it—"the conclusion of this state;" and both Wakefield and Macknight—"the end of the age." Indeed, all the critics and commentators which I have ever seen, allow, that this phrase means the end of the Jewish age or dispensation. The whole discourse in which it occurs shows that this is a correct view of the expression. In a case so obvious, it would be useless to spend time in a formal proof of it. I may just notice, to understand *aion* here to mean endless duration of time, would represent the disciples as asking our Lord to tell them, what should be the sign of his coming, and of "the end of the everlasting or endless duration." But if it means age, it ought to be understood so in other places, unless good reasons can be offered why it ought to be differently understood. The next passage where it occurs is

Matth. 13: 36—42. "Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man: the field is the world: the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one: the enemy that sowed them is the devil: the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Precisely the same Greek phrase as in the last text, occurs twice in this passage, and is rendered in the common version in a similar manner. Wakefield and Dr. Campbell render it in the same way, "the conclusion of this age," and "the conclusion of this state." But instead of understanding it in the same way, it is referred to the end of this material world, when all the wicked shall be cast into a furnace of fire, or into hell. But is this treating the language of the inspired writers with common respect? What man would put up with having his words so interpreted? But that the phrase, "the end of the world," has the same sense here as in the preceding passage I shall now briefly show. The things which demand particular attention are

1st. The field in which both these seeds are said to be sown. It is said expressly, "the field is *the world*." The word for world here is *kosmos*, and not *aion*, which is also rendered world, verses 39, 40. Now, let it be particularly observed, that in these two verses where it is said, "the harvest is the end

of the world," and "in the end of the world," when the tares were to be gathered, it is not the end of the *kosmos*, world, or field, in which the seeds were sown, but the end of the *aion*, or age, as in Matth. 24: 3. Our Lord declared that the end of this world or age was to take place during that generation. But in order to make out the common opinion, our Lord should have said verses 39, 40. "the harvest is the end of the *kosmos*, or field, in which the two seeds were sown: and that in the end of this *kosmos*, world, the tares should be gathered and burned." But not a word is said about the end of the field, but only the end of the *aion*, or age, which many of that generation lived to see.

2d. Where this furnace of fire was and in what it consisted, into which the tares were cast at the end of the age. This furnace of fire is commonly believed to be in a future state of existence, and is just another expression for hell fire. But all this is taken for granted, which certainly ought to be proved. Where then was it? Let the Scriptures answer the question. In Isai. 31: 9. it is said "The Lord whose fire is in Zion and whose furnace is in Jerusalem." It should be remembered, that our Lord spoke to Jews who had the Old Testament in their hands, and without doubt knew that God had thus spoken by the prophet. But it may be asked, How was God's furnace in Jerusalem and in what did it consist? Ezek. 22: 17-23. will inform us of this—"And the word of the Lord came unto me saying, Son of man, the house of Israel is to me become dross; all they are brass, and tin, and iron, and lead, in the midst of the furnace; they are even the dross of silver. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Because ye are all become dross, behold therefore, I will gather you into the midst of Jerusalem. As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the

fire upon it, to melt it ; so will I gather you in my anger, and in my fury, and I will leave *you there*, and melt you. Yea, I will gather you and blow upon you in the fire of my wrath, and ye shall be melted in the midst thereof. As silver is melted in the midst of the furnace, so shall ye be melted in the midst thereof; and ye shall know that I the Lord have poured out my fury upon you." Who can read this passage without perceiving where this furnace was, in what it consisted, and also who were cast into it? Permit me briefly to notice the following things from this passage in connexion with our Lord's explanation of the parable under consideration. The prophet and our Lord both spoke of the same persons, the Jews. At the end of the age, as the prophet had declared, the whole Jewish nation had become "*dross*." With the exception of believers in Jesus, the nation of the Jews exactly corresponded to this description of them. This one fact is sufficient to show, that the prophet and our Lord, had respect to the same time, people, and punishment. Our Lord seems to borrow his very language, in regard to the furnace of fire, from the prophet. Further, it was at the end of the age, or Jewish dispensation, God brought such dreadful miseries on the Jewish nation, described under the figure of a furnace of fire. Ezekiel declared that God would gather the Jewish nation into Jerusalem as men "gather metals into the midst of a furnace." This was literally fulfilled. With the strictest propriety it might be said, that God gathered them, for it was in obedience to the command of God the whole nation were assembled at the feast of the passover, when Titus surrounded the city, and from which they could not make their escape. They had indeed become *dross*, and into this furnace they were gathered to be melted as metals are gathered to be melted in the midst of a furnace. Well, how did God melt

them? This is figurative language, and is thus explained verse 22. "And ye shall know that I the Lord have poured out my fury upon you." Upon that generation of the Jews came all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, Matth. 23: 35. Then was great "tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world unto this time, no, nor ever shall be," Matth. 24: 21. See also 1 Thess. 2: 16. If any one wishes to see how God melted them like metals in this furnace, or how the tares were cast into this furnace to be burnt, at the end of the age, let him consult Josephus' account of the destruction of Jerusalem. The above passage in Ezekiel, the 24th of Matthew, and the passage before us, all had their fulfilment in the unheard of calamities which came on that people. There was indeed, at this period, weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth, as our Lord declared.

But the following words strongly confirm the above remarks. At verse 43. our Lord said, "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their father." At the end of the age, when such miseries came on the unbelieving Jews, the righteous, or Christ's disciples, did shine forth in the kingdom of their father. Observing the signs of the approaching calamities, Matth. 24. they left the city and were preserved, as stated by Macknight on this chapter. Our Lord told them, Luke 21: 28. "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." Previous to this, Christians suffered the most severe persecutions from the Jews, but then they had rest from their persecutors. At that period the kingdom of God came with power. Christ was glorified in them, and they were glorified in him. See on 2 Thess. chap. 1. below. In the words—"then shall the righteous shine forth in the kingdom of their father," there

seems to be an allusion to Dan. 12: 2. which has been shown, refers to the same time and events.

Such is a brief statement of our views of this passage. In confirmation of them I would add the following. It has been shown that the temporal judgments of God on the Jewish nation are set forth under the figure of a furnace of fire. Now, we call on any man to produce a single passage, where a punishment in a future state of existence, is described under such a figure. It will not do to take it for granted, that this is done by our Lord in this passage, and in face of all the evidence we have adduced to the contrary. No; let proof be brought forward that this is his meaning. Let it be accounted for, why the temporal calamities which came on the Jewish nation are spoken of under the figure of a furnace of fire, yet future eternal punishment is never so represented in the Scripture? Besides, let some reason be given why the same Greek phrase, rendered the end of the world, Matth. 24: 3. and allowed to mean the end of the age or Jewish dispensation, should not also mean the very same thing in the passage before us? Scripture usage, both as to this phrase and the furnace of fire, is against the common opinion, and in favor of the views I have advanced. It is very evident also from the New Testament, that at the end of the Jewish age, a separation was to take place, and is represented under various figures, as well as in plain language. In the passage before us, this separation between the righteous and the wicked, is represented by separating tares and wheat. In others, separating chaff and wheat, good and bad fishes, &c. The question is—Did a separation take place at the end of the Jewish age, answerable to these figurative representations? I answer without hesitation, yes. The whole Jewish nation were like chaff and wheat promiscuously on the same floor, whether believers

in Christ, or unbelievers. Or like good and bad fishes in the same net, or as tares and wheat growing in the same field. But no one doubts, that at the end of the age a separation did take place, when the Jews were scattered among all nations, and the separation between them and Christians, or children of the kingdom, has continued to this day.

It is very evident, that *aion* in this passage, could not well be rendered by any word signifying endless duration. If it were, it would make our Lord to say, "the harvest is the end of the everlasting or forever," and, "so shall it be in the end of this everlasting or forever." But who would impute such things to him, who spake as never man spake? To suppose he did, would make a plurality of forevers; for *this forever* implies another forever. Besides, it shows that forever is to end, and that the endless punishment of the wicked is only to begin at the end of the forever, if the furnace of fire means hell fire in another state of existence.

Any objections which have occurred to the views advanced, I shall state and answer. 1st. "How, upon your views, could it be said, that the devil sowed the tares among the wheat?" If this be any objection against my views, it lies equally against the common view taken of this passage. If my views of the devil be correct, this objection has no force. 2d. "Upon your views of this passage, how are angels to reap the harvest at the end of the age?" In reply, let it be noticed, that the term angel simply signifies a messenger. Let any one consult Whitby or Macknight, and he will see that the angels here referred to were not angelic spirits, but human messengers. He will also see how the separation at the end of the age was effected by them. But see on Matth. 25. below. 3d. "Why was the temporal miseries which came on the Jews represented under the figure of a

furnace of fire?" Answer; for a very good reason. A furnace of fire was the severest punishment which an eastern despot could devise. See Daniel 3. The temporal judgments which came on the Jews at the end of the age were such as the like had never been before, nor shall the like ever be again. The most severe eastern punishment, a furnace of fire, is therefore chosen to describe them. See Mark 13 : 19, 20.

Matth. 13 : 47—50. The same Greek phrase as in the two preceding texts occurs here, and is rendered in the same way. As our Lord is only illustrating the same things, and uses the very same figure of a furnace of fire, we forbear either transcribing it, or remarking on it. The remarks made on the last passage are sufficient.

Matth. 28 : 20. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you : and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Precisely the same Greek phrase occurs here as in the foregoing texts, and is rendered the same way in the common version. Wakefield renders it—"the conclusion of the age;" and Campbell—"the conclusion of this state." Parkhurst considers the Greek phrase here as referring to the end of the age of the Messiah, and as equivalent to the end of this world, yet precisely the same phrase, Matth. 24 : 3. he says signifies the end of the Jewish age or dispensation. But I ask—Why depart from the obvious sense of this expression, Matth. 24 : 3. ? Scripture usage ought not to be departed from without good reasons. What leads to such a departure here, probably is, that to say "the end of the world" means the end of the age or Jewish dispensation, would limit Christ's promise to be with his disciples to this period. This would not certainly follow. But I shall proceed to show that

in the sense Christ here promised to be with his disciples, it was not needed beyond the end of the Jewish dispensation.

It seems to be overlooked that our Lord was here addressing himself to the eleven apostles. Nor is it sufficiently understood in what sense he promised to be with them unto the end of the age. If verse 16. and the parallel texts are consulted, it appears that the apostles are the persons of whom he speaks, and he promised to be with them in a sense he never was, and never will be again with any other persons. He was with them, in teaching them the doctrine and laws of his kingdom, and enabling them to work miracles in proof of their being his ambassadors to the world. But will any man have the arrogance to affirm, that Christ is with him in such a sense? The vain and arrogant pretences of men to being ambassadors of Christ, we hope is now nearly exploded. Supposing then, that all the apostles had lived beyond the end of the age, or the destruction of Jerusalem, yea, let it be granted that they were all yet alive, there was no need for Christ being with them longer than to the end of the age. Am I asked why? I answer, before this period arrived the gospel must be preached to all the world. See Matth. 24 : 14. When it arrived, the apostles had all finished their work for which they were called, and all of them except John had also finished their course. Allowing that they had all continued to live to the present day, would Christ have continued to be with them, still teaching them and enabling them to work miracles? I ask what need there was for this? All the will of God was revealed, and his word attested by miracles before the end of the age. Unless God had some further revelation to make by them, they could but repeat what before was preached and committed to

writing, and fully attested by miracles. Were they now alive, would they not like us believe and obey what God, previous to the end of the age, enabled them to communicate to the world? This I am persuaded few will question. It is easily seen then, that the phrase "the end of the world," is in agreement with the usage of it in all the other texts, and that Christ's promise to be with his apostles at this period, was as long as his promise was needed, or indeed could be enjoyed by them in this mortal state.

I may just notice that I have no occasion to discuss the disputed question, that miracles were continued in the church for the first three hundred years. Granting that they were continued, let it be noticed, that none but the apostles were our Lord's commissioned and accredited ambassadors to the world. With them, and them only, we have to do as instructors. If he was with any others working miracles beyond the end of the Jewish age, it does not concern us, nor does it affect the question we are at present considering.

It is very plain that *aion*, here rendered world, was not used to express endless duration. To suppose this, would make our Lord promise to be with his apostles to the end of everlasting or eternity. This would give rise to many questions. What time does eternity end? If it ends, pray when did it begin? And were the apostles to live to the end of eternity? Besides, if eternity ends, how is endless punishment to be established?

Heb. 9 : 26. "For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." The word *world* occurs twice in this verse, but in the first it is the rendering of the word *kosmos*, and in the second that of *aionon*. Most readers suppose the first has a

reference to the beginning of this material world, and the second to the end of it. The first is true, but nothing could be further from the truth than the second. Was it in the end of this material world Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself? It was not in the end of the *kosmos* or world mentioned in the first part of the verse, but in the end of the ages. Hence Macknight renders it thus: "but now once, at the conclusion of the ages, he hath been manifested to abolish sin-offering by the sacrifice of himself." All must see how absurd it would be to say here, that at the end of the everlastings or eternities, Christ appeared to abolish sin-offering. It is agreeable to the fact, that at the end of the ages or Jewish dispensation he did appear and accomplish this.

1 Cor. 10: 11. "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come." Though the Greek expression here is somewhat different from that used in the preceding passages, without a doubt the apostle referred to the same period. Macknight renders it "upon whom the ends of the ages are come." In his note he says, "this may mean the end of the Mosaic dispensation, whose duration was measured by ages or jubilees; see Rom. 16: 25. note 3. or, it may signify the last dispensation of religion. For there was the Patriarchal age, or dispensation, the Mosaic age, and the Gospel age." See Whitby's note on this text, who renders this phrase "the end of the ages."

In concluding our remarks on all these texts it ought to be noticed, that even admitting endless misery true, some of them have been perverted in attempting to prove it. How often has the furnace of fire afforded a theme of declamation to preachers, and cause of pain and distress to those who believed them. But is it

saying too much, that they were only beating the air, and perverting Scripture to create fears where there really were none. My labour is not lost if I have rescued such passages of God's word from such a perversion. In my explanation of this phrase, I have shown its usage to be uniform throughout the New Testament, and the precision and consistency of the sacred writers in its use are manifest. Every candid mind will allow, that all the passages which speak of the end of the world or age, correspond to the preceding which made mention of the beginning of the world or age. In both classes of texts, we have seen that critics and commentators are agreed, both orthodox and heterodox, that *aion*, world, does not signify this material world, but age, state, or dispensation.

I shall now proceed to consider two other classes of texts in which *aion* occurs, corresponding to each other in the New Testament. Those which speak of "this world or age," and "the world or age to come." Let us first bring forward all those which speak of *this world*. *Aion* and *kosmos* both rendered *world*, are very different in signification, and we do not recollect an instance, where these words are used as synonymous. In the texts now to be introduced, the word for *world* is not *kosmos* but *aion*. The phrases for "this world" are *tou aionos touto*, *to aioni touto*, and *en to nun aioni*, and occur in the following places. 2 Cor. 4 : 4. "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not." On this text Macknight says "some have it *age*." In Eph. 6 : 12. "for we wrestle against the rulers of the darkness of this world." Wakefield here renders *aion* *age*. But again it is said, Gal. 1 : 4. "Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world." Here again Wakefield has it *age*. On this text Macknight thus writes: "Evil age, *aionos*

poneros. In Scripture, the age or world, is often put for the men of the world, and for their evil principles and practices. Thus Rom. 12 : 2. "be not conformed, *aion* *touto*, to this age." And in Luke 16 : 8. it is said "for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." In 2 Tim. 4 : 10. it is said, "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world." It surely cannot be meant, that he loved this present everlasting or forever : nor, that the children of this forever, were wiser than the children of light. In Rom. 12 : 2. it is said—"and be not conformed to *this world*." In 1 Cor. 3 : 18. "If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world." I may just notice, that *aion* is here rendered age, both by Wakefield and Macknight. Again, 1 Tim. 6 : 17. it is said, "charge them that are rich in this world." And Tit. 2 : 12. "Teaching that we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." In the two last texts the Greek is, *en to nun aioni*, and ought to have been rendered in both the same way. It is obvious, *aion* could not have been rendered everlasting or forever in any of these texts, without making the inspired writers speak nonsense. Nor can we perceive, why the above critics rendered *aion* age, in 1 Cor. 3 : 18. and not so in all the other places. But to proceed : in Matth. 13 : 22. it is said, "and the cares of this world choke the word." See the same, Mark 4 : 19. And 1 Cor. 1 : 20. it is said, "Where is the wise ? Where is the scribe ? Where is the disputer of this world ? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world ?" I may just notice here that the word for world in the last part of this verse and in verse 21. is not *aion*, but *kosmos* in the original. A marked distinction is made between them in the Greek, though this is concealed, by both being rendered *world* in our version. In 1 Cor. 2 : 6 —3. it is said, "howbeit we speak wisdom among

them that are perfect; yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to naught: but we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world know: for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." The word *aion* here is rendered by Waksfield *age*, and Macknight's note on it shows us what is meant by the phrase rendered *this world* in all the above passages. He says, "Locke observes that in the writings of the New Testament, *aion outes*, this world, commonly signifies the state of mankind before the publication of the Gospel, as contradistinguished to the evangelical state or constitution, which is commonly called, *aion mellon*, the world to come." The following things are worthy of notice in this quotation. 1st. It is allowed that the phrase *this world*, does not mean this material world, but signifies the state of mankind before the publication of the Gospel. And 2d. That this state, is contradistinguished from another called the evangelical state or constitution, and called *aion mellon*, the world to come. If this be correct, it essentially alters the sense of all the passages where these expressions occur. Am I asked, How it does this? I answer; that in the passages where the expression *this world* occurs, people understand it to mean this material world, and by the expression *world to come* is universally understood the future state of endless existence. The above quotation applies to all the texts where the phrases *this world* and *the world to come* occur. Such are all the texts where the phrase *this world* occurs by itself. It is found in some others, and is joined with the phrase *world to come*. Before introducing these I would notice the following things from the texts already brought forward.

1st. Supposing that *aion* in the above texts had been rendered everlasting, forever, or by any word conveying the idea of endless duration, what would have followed? We should then have read of this forever, this present forever, and of this present evil forever. This would naturally lead to the inquiry, how many forevers are there? And how many of them are evil? We should also be exhorted not to be conformed to this forever, and to become fools in this forever, and to live soberly, righteously and godly in this forever, and the rich that they should not be high minded in this forever. We should also be told, that the cares of this forever choke the word; and the question would be asked,—where is the disputer of this forever? Besides, the apostle would be made to say, that he spoke of the wisdom and princes of this forever, even the wisdom which God ordained before the forever, and which none of the princes of this forever knew. We should also read of the God of this forever, and the rulers of the darkness of this forever, and Christ gave himself that he might deliver us from this present evil forever.

2d. The word *world*, by which *aion* is rendered in the above texts conceals all these glaring improprieties, but it is obvious enough, that even *world* is not a very correct rendering. Who does not perceive this in the passages where it is said "this present world," and, "this present evil world?" The questions here naturally enough occur,—how many worlds are there, how many of them are evil, and is not this world always present? Why then speak of it not only as evil but as present? And, according to the sense commonly affixed to the word world, how could the apostle with truth say, that none of the princes of this world had known Christ? Surely some princes of this world knew him, for Abraham was a mighty prince, and rejoiced to see his day afar off and was glad.

3d. It is easily seen that if *aion* is rendered age in all the above texts, not only are such improprieties avoided, but a beauty and force is added to some of them, which is concealed by our present translation. Convinced of this, some of the most eminent orthodox critics and commentators, have rendered *aion* age, and the translators of our common version have done the same in several passages. Why it was not done in many more, deserves the reader's consideration. We believe it is now a generally conceded point, that age, in a great many instances at least, is a better rendering than the word world. I may add, if any one contends for *aion* to mean endless duration it may also be contended that there is more than one eternity, for this *aion* if it does mean forever, implies one or more of the same thing.

Let us now attend to the passages where the phrase "world to come" is used. The first is Heb. 6 : 5. "And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come." The Greek for "world to come" is *mellontos aionos*. Let us then hear what good orthodox writers say is the sense of this expression. Whitby, on this text, says, "The world to come doth, in the language of the prophets, and Jewish doctors, signify the times of the Messiah, who, in the prophet Isaiah, is called *the father of the world to come*. See note on chap. 2 : 5. 'The powers, therefore, of the world to come, according to the Scripture idiom, must be the external operations of the Holy Ghost, viz. the gifts of faith, of healing, of casting out devils, 1 Cor. 12 : 8, 9. *the working of miracles*, or the operations of powers." Peirce says, "*The world or age to come* is a Hebrew phrase and signifies the times of the Messiah, *oulm eba*." Macknight gives us the same explanation as Whitby; and Dr. Owen, whose praise is in all orthodox churches, explains this phrase in the same manner. See also the new Theological

Repository, vol. i. p. 51—53. for the same explanation, given at considerable length, all of which my limits forbid quoting. We have introduced, on the phrase *world to come*, all these testimonies for several reasons. These authors are as one man agreed about the meaning of this expression. They are competent to judge in the case, and not one of them was ever suspected of unbelief in the doctrine of endless misery. What then is their united decision? They establish beyond all contradiction, that the phrase “world to come,” does not mean the future eternal state of existence after death, but the age of the Messiah. But how do men understand this phrase in the present day? They usually understand it to mean, that state on which we enter at death, and is to continue forever.

‘Heb. 2: 5. “For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come whereof we speak.” The Greek phrase, here rendered the “world to come,” is *oikoumene ton mellousan*, which evidently means the same as in the last text. Parkhurst, on the word *oikoumene*, says, “The world to come, Heb. 2: 5. seems to denote the state of the world under the Messiah, or the kingdom of the Messiah, which began at his first advent, and shall be completed at his second glorious coming. The Jews in like manner call the kingdom of the Messiah, *eba oulem*, the world to come, probably from the prophesy of Isai. 65: 17. where it is represented by *new heavens and a new earth*. It is observable that Paul uses this phrase only in this passage of his Epistle to the *Hebrews* or *converted Jews*, as being, I suppose, a manner of expression peculiar to them, but not so intelligible to the Gentile converts. See Whitby and Dodridge on the place, and comp. Heb. 6: 5.” See also Peirce on this text, and on Heb. 1: 14. All these, and other writers which might be named, give the same explanation of the phrase,

world to come, which I forbear quoting. But in the following texts the phrase, "this world," and "the world to come," are mentioned together.

Eph. 1 : 21. "Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that to come." The Greek here is, *ou monon en to aioni touto alla kai en to mellonti*, which Wakefield renders, "not only in this, but also in the future age."

Matth. 12 : 31, 32. "Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men : but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the son of man it shall be forgiven him, but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." See the parallel texts, Mark 3 : 28—30. and Luke 12 : 10. which I need not quote. The common doctrine from these passages is—that neither before nor after death can the sin against the Holy Ghost be forgiven. As this doctrine has driven some to madness, and others to suicide, common humanity would say, "*examine if it be true.*" Those who contend for it, overlook that it is implied that some sins may be forgiven in the world to come, if their view of this phrase be correct. But do they allow that any sins are to be forgiven after death? Taking into view all the above passages, let us consider,

1st. Wherein the great guilt of the sin against the Holy Spirit consisted. From Mark 3 : 28—30. and other places, it appears that the guilt of this sin consisted in seeing miracles wrought and imputing them to the power of an unclean spirit. It was resisting the highest degree of evidence which could be given of the mission of our Lord. But on this point it is

unnecessary for us to dwell. Therefore, let us consider,

2d. When or where it could not be forgiven. It is said it shall not be forgiven in "this world." This means, as we have seen from orthodox writers, it should not be forgiven in the Jewish age, which was then nearly ended. Nor, could it be forgiven in the world or age to come, which we have seen from the same authors, means the age of the Messiah, which was to succeed the Jewish age or dispensation. Whitby renders the words, "neither in this age, nor the age to come." It seems then a very obvious case, that when it is said the sin against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come, there is no reference to a state after death. It simply means, it should not be forgiven while the Jewish age or dispensation continued, nor under the age of the Messiah, which was then about to commence. Or, in other words, during the ministry of our Lord or his apostles, who both wrought miracles, which were necessary to be seen wrought and blasphemed against, in order to any person's committing this sin.

Well, its being said, it "hath neither forgiveness," and, "it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come," is strong, explicit language, importing the non-forgiveness of this sin? It is, nor do we wish to lessen its force, but shall attempt to meet it fairly and fully. But let us first hear Macknight. He says—"or we may translate the clause differently, *it shall not be forgiven him neither in this age, neither in the age to come*, importing that no expiation was provided for the blasphemer of the spirit, either under the Jewish or Christian dispensations." What then was the unpardonable nature of the sin of blasphemy during the period called "this world," which we have seen means the Jewish

age or dispensation? It is well known, that to the blasphemer under the law, no pardon was granted; no sacrifice could expiate his crime; he must suffer death. Permit me now to ask, was the punishment of such persons unpardonable in any other sense than that they suffered temporal death? Even the blasphemer of the God of Israel, his blasphemy is not mentioned as unpardonable, so as to affect his future endless happiness. No one surely will contend, that to blaspheme against the Holy Spirit was a greater crime; for allowing the Spirit to be the third person in the Godhead, he is not greater than the God of Israel. How then do we understand this blasphemy to be a sin, which, when committed, the person's case is past all remedy? But other sins besides blasphemy were unpardonable under the Mosaic dispensation. The sin of Moses and Aaron at Meribah was so, and was punished with death in the wilderness. The sin of Eli's house could not be purged with sacrifice nor burnt offering forever. Murder was also unpardonable. They were to take the murderer from God's altar and put him to death. As "the world to come," then refers to the age of the Messiah, this sin is to be unpardonable, and unpardonable in the same sense as it was during the Jewish age called "this world." Its unpardonable nature we think must be understood in the same sense, for no distinction is made by our Lord in the two cases. If the sense in which it was unpardonable during the Jewish age, was, that the person must suffer temporal death for it, the same must be its sense under the age of the Messiah. It is generally admitted, that temporal death was the punishment of crimes under the old dispensation, and that temporal death was inflicted for crimes under the new, no one will dispute; for Annanias and his wife, persons in the church at Corinth, are noted examples; and John speaks of a sin

unto death, for which even Christians were not to pray, 1 John 5 : 16, 17.

Stating then this sin at its utmost extent, persons were to suffer death for it, as was inflicted on the blasphemer of the God of Israel. What, some may say, do men suffer death for this sin in our day? I answer no, and for a very good reason, because it is impossible in the nature of the case to commit it in the present day. Is it asked why? I answer, because miracles must be seen performed by the person, and he must resist their evidence, and ascribe their performance to an unclean spirit, before he can commit this sin. It could only then be committed by persons under the ministry of our Lord and his disciples, who wrought miracles. Did men now see these miracles, as the persons did whom our Lord addressed, it could be committed, but unless the age of miracles return, it is impossible. The miracles wrought by our Lord and his apostles before the Jews, was the highest degree of evidence which could be given them that he was the true Messiah. Resisting and blaspheming them, rendered their case hopeless, for no further evidence could be given to convince them. But it may be said, Did the unbelieving Jews suffer temporal death for this crime? They could not be put to death for it by the Mosaic law, for they did not believe they had in this case blasphemed. Besides, the execution of this law was in their own hands. But death was inflicted on that evil generation of Jews, for upon them came all the righteous blood shed upon the earth. Not believing in Jesus, they died in, or rather, by their sins, for the wrath of God came on them to the uttermost.

If the views which have been stated of the sin of blasphemy, and its punishment, be correct, it fully accounts for one remarkable fact, which is not easily accounted for on the common views entertained of it.

How is it accounted for, that our Lord nor his apostles ever made any exception of such persons, in preaching forgiveness of sins either to Jews or Gentiles? Our Lord commanded his apostles to begin at Jerusalem, but gives no directions to them to except a single individual whom they might address. John prohibits Christians from praying for one of their brethren, who had sinned a sin unto death, but not a hint is dropped, prohibiting forgiveness of sins to be preached to any who had blasphemed against the Holy Spirit. On my views of this sin, this is all as it ought to be, and as might be expected. But can it ever be reconciled with the common opinion, that those who sinned this sin placed themselves without the boundaries of God's mercy? Either they believed that none had committed it, or they believed that it did not except the persons, any more than others, from having repentance and forgiveness of sins preached unto them. Had they believed such persons were exceptions from the mercy of God, would they not have said something similar to John—"there is a sin unto death, the sin against the Holy Spirit, which is utterly unpardonable. All you who have committed it, your situation is past remedy. We can neither pray for you, nor preach to you forgiveness." But we search in vain for any thing like this in all the inspired writings. The only thing like it is John's prohibition to Christians to pray for a brother who had sinned a sin unto death. But no one understands this as affecting the eternal condition of the individual, but the punishment of temporal death.

But it may be said—"Plausible as all this appears, it ought to be recollected, that it is not only said such persons 'hath never forgiveness,' but it is also added, that they are in danger of *eternal damnation*." I have not forgotten this, and shall now give it all due

attention. The Greek phrase for 'eternal damnation' is *aioniou kriseos*. I do not stop to remark, but simply notice, that the persons are only said to be in *danger* of this; whereas people in our day, speak with positive certainty, both as to this and Judas' being in hell. The word here rendered *damnation*, simply means punishment. It is so rendered in other passages. See Dr. Campbell's note on Mark 12: 40. where he shows this. The words *damned* and *damnation*, lead people's minds into a future state for this punishment. This is a very false idea, and ought to be corrected; for the word *damnation* is used in the common version where they will allow it has nothing to do with a future state. See Rom. 13: 2. and other places. We are aware it will be said, the word *eternal* joined here with *damnation*, shows that the punishment is in a future state, and of endless duration. It is then allowed that the whole depends upon the word *eternal*. Indeed, I presume it is this word joined with *damnation* which leads most people to conclude that it is of endless duration. Would they ever have believed this doctrine had this not been the case? Let it be noticed,

1st. That our Lord in the above passages was addressing Jews. They were the persons who committed this unpardonable sin, if ever it was committed. They had the occasion presented to them for its commission, as they chiefly enjoyed the ministry and miracles both of Christ and his apostles. Not a hint is dropped that any of the Gentiles ever committed this sin.

2d. Being Jews, they were familiar with the use of *olim* in the Old, and *aion* in the New Testament. And it has been seen, that *olim* in their Scriptures, is applied very often to things which were to end, and which have already ended. The person who would therefore understand this text and others in the New

Testament, must consider how this language was understood among the Jews, and not how Christians now understand them.

3d. The Jews could not help seeing, that in their Scriptures, *olim*, rendered everlasting, was applied to a temporal punishment threatened them as a nation. This we have shown, and this we shall show hereafter on Matth. chap. 25. and 2 Thess. 1 : 5—10. Now permit me to ask, Did any Jew, or did any one else ever conclude that the word *olim* described a never-ending punishment either in this or a future world? As this will not be affirmed, permit me to ask, By what fair rule of interpretation do we then interpret eternal damnation or punishment in this passage, to mean endless punishment in a future state? As our Lord was speaking to Jews, is it not more Scriptural and natural to understand him as using this expression in agreement with the language of their sacred books, than in the sense Christians interpret it? In what other sense could our Lord use it, or in what other sense could Jews understand such language, but in the way it had been used by the preceding Scripture writers? But this will appear conclusive by considering,

4th. That in no part of the Old Testament, is *olim* ever used and applied to a punishment after death. This we think a fact, which will not easily be shown to be false. The reader has had all the texts where the word is used in the Old Testament laid before him, and those in which it could be supposed to have such a sense have been particularly considered. Let him, then, judge if our Lord used, and the Jews could understand the expression, eternal damnation, in the sense we moderns put upon it. The proof, at any rate, lies with those who believe so, for no man can prove a negative. But we have in this case some proof, that our Lord neither meant, nor was he so un-

derstood by the Jews who heard him. First, no Jew believed that he was to suffer endless punishment either here or hereafter. See Whitby on Rom. 2. Again, no doctrine our Lord advanced, could have been more displeasing to the Jews. They to suffer endless punishment who were the children of Abraham? No; this was far from their thoughts. But again, though our Lord and the Jews had many reasonings and contentions arising from his doctrines, do we ever find that any of them arose from his threatening them with endless punishment in a future state? No, nothing like this appears. Either then our Lord did not threaten them with this, or if he did, they did not understand him; or, if they did understand him, they acted very differently about it from what they did on all other occasions. In this case, they submitted very tamely to a threatening, never before mentioned in their Scriptures, and directly in face of all their prejudices as a nation.

5th. We see nothing in the expression. "eternal damnation," indicating endless punishment, any more than in others which we think we have shown refer to no such thing. Is this expression stronger in favor of the doctrine than "damnation of hell, the fire that shall never be quenched," with others which we think has been proved in the Inquiry into the words Sheol, &c. to refer to temporal punishment? Or, is it stronger in favor of this doctrine than the expressions "everlasting fire, eternal punishment, everlasting destruction, with others, which we shall presently show have no such meaning? If these expressions refer to the temporal punishment of the Jews, why not also the expression "eternal damnation," before us? Jews who blasphemed against the Holy Spirit were addressed. The most convincing proofs had been offered them that Jesus was the Messiah. These they resisted, and blasphemed the power by which they

were performed. They were soon to fill up the measure of their iniquity, and could not escape the damnation of hell. There remained for them no more sacrifice for their sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation to devour them as adversaries. Their sin was not to be forgiven, that their punishment might be averted. They were in danger of "eternal damnation," or punishment, even the everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, which as a nation they have suffered, and are still suffering. The Greek phrase, "*aioniou krisis*," rendered "eternal damnation," may be rendered "of the age of judgment," or "of the judgment of the age" both words being in the genitive. It is called the damnation of hell, the fire that shall never be quenched, the greater damnation, and is set forth by the severest eastern punishment, "a furnace of fire." In plain language it is described by our Lord, Matth. chaps. 24, 25.

Matth. 19: 27—29. "Then answered Peter, and said unto him, behold, we have forsaken all and followed thee: what shall we have therefore? And Jesus said unto them, verily I say unto you, that ye that have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life." The parallel texts are Mark 10: 28—31. and Luke 18: 28—30. which I need not quote. Mark and Luke say, "and in the world to come life everlasting." Wakefield's rendering is, "and in the age that is coming everlasting life." It will not be questioned, that the phrases, "this time," and "this present time" in these texts, express the same as is

meant by the phrase "this world," or age, in preceding passages. They all refer to the Jewish age, which was to be superseded by the age of the Messiah, and repeatedly called the age or "world to come." In fact no other age could come, for no other was promised, or expected by the Jews, but the age of the Messiah. But the phrase, "world to come," by most Christians is interpreted to mean, the state after death, and the phrase "everlasting life," the happiness to be enjoyed in that state. But, that by "the world to come," is meant the age of the Messiah, is conclusively shown by orthodox writers above, who declare it is to end at Christ's second coming. See 1 Cor. 15: 24—28. My reasons for thinking, that the eternal life here spoken of, refers to the life enjoyed in the kingdom of Christ during the age of the Messiah, I shall as briefly as possible state:

1st. This appears from the Old Testament usage of the phrase "everlasting life," which occurs only in Dan. 12: 2. considered above. It is set in contrast with the shame and everlasting contempt which came on the Jewish nation at the end of the age. If their shame and everlasting contempt, were to be *endured* in this state of existence, why not the eternal life with which it is contrasted, be *enjoyed* also in the same state? The contrast would be incongruous if it is understood otherwise.

2d. From the context of the passages under consideration, it is evident, that what our Lord said was in answer to Peter's question, verse 27. which was suggested by the discourse immediately preceding it, verses 16—27. According to Daniel's use of the words *eternal life*, what else could this man mean, than, what good thing shall I do, that I may enjoy the blessings of Messiah's reign, or enter into his kingdom? That this view of ever-

lasting life, is agreeable to the passage before us; is evident, for it was to be enjoyed in "the world to come," or in the age of the Messiah. The Jews were familiar with Daniel's writings, and if in this sense it was used there, how could the Jews in our Lord's day understand it in a different sense without some explanation? That this was the sense in which it was used, appears to me evident from the following statements, and the texts referred to. In the New Testament, "kingdom of heaven," and "kingdom of God," are phrases used to express the same thing: comp. Matth. 19: 23. with verse 24. as an example. This is very obvious from comparing the four Gospels. It is also evident, that to "have eternal life," and to "enter into eternal life," also mean the same thing. Comp. Matth. 19: 16. with verse 17. But let it be particularly observed, that to "enter into life," and "to have eternal life," is the same as "to enter into the kingdom of heaven," or "kingdom of God." This appears from comparing Matth. 19: 16, 17. with verses 23, 24. Also from comparing Mark 9: 43, 45. with verse 47. where entering into the kingdom of heaven and entering into life are used as equivalent expressions. If these statements are not correct, we should think it a hopeless case, to ascertain the sense of Scripture by comparing one part of it with another. I may add, that "to be saved," verse 25. of Matth. 19. seems to be used as an equivalent expression for "having eternal life," verse 16. "to enter into life," verse 17. and "to enter into the kingdom of heaven and kingdom of God," verses 23, 24. Let us now look at the context of the passage before us. "And behold, one came and said to him good master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life," verse 16. And comp. Mark 10: 17. Luke 18: 18. Luke 10: 25. Permit me now to ask—When this person asked what good thing he

should do to "have eternal life," did he mean to ask, what he should do to obtain heaven and its happiness? We must doubt this, for we have seen that what he calls eternal life, verse 16. is to enter into life, verse 17. and to enter into the kingdom of heaven or kingdom of God, verses 23, 24. His meaning seems evidently to be, good master, what shall I do to enter into the kingdom of heaven or reign of the Messiah, whose kingdom or reign is about commencing. If this be correct, it is easily perceived how exactly this sense of the phrase agrees with the only place in the Old Testament where everlasting life is mentioned. Daniel told us that some should awake "to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." This person seemed to be awaking to everlasting life, but we see that his trusting in his riches, still kept him from entering into the kingdom of God. One seems to have been so much awakened, that our Lord said that he was not far from the kingdom of God, or obtaining eternal life. See Mark 12: 28—35.

3d. It appears from considering *where* or *when* this eternal life was to be enjoyed. Not a word is said in the passage, that this was in a future state of existence. It was to be when the Son of man sat on the throne of his glory, and the apostles on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. But are the apostles to sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel in a future state of existence? Well, when was this? The following writers shall inform us. Macknight, on this passage, observes—"According to the common interpretation of these words, they relate entirely to the other life; implying, that at the general judgment the apostles shall assist Christ in passing sentence upon the Israelites." But so far from agreeing to this interpretation, he says—"In the 7th chapter of Daniel, the prophet,

aking of the erection of the Messiah's kingdom, s, verse 9. *I beheld till the thrones were set* (not cast m, as it is in our translation) *and the Ancient of days sit*, namely, on one of the thrones that were set. *And behold one like the Son of man came to the Ancient of days* while he sat on his throne, *and they brought near before him, and there was given him dominion, glory, and a kingdom.* By the kingdom that was en to the Son of man, the prophet meant his mediatorial kingdom; and by *the glory*, his being seated ide the Ancient of days on one of the thrones ntioned, verse 9. in testimony of his exaltation to t kingdom. The throne of his glory, therefore, ich our Lord speaks of in the text, is the throne his mediatorial kingdom, called the throne of his ry, in allusion to the representation which Daniel l given of it. In this kingdom, the apostles like-e were to be seated on thrones, and to judge the es; that is, were to be next the Messiah in digni-and office; his ministers, by whom he was to sub-and govern the church." See the whole of his e, a small part of which only I have quoted. See o Parkhurst on the word *krino*, who gives the same w of the passage. Dr. Campbell renders the 28th se thus: "that at the renovation, when the Son of n shall be seated in his glorious throne, ye, my owers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall ge." In his note, part of which only I shall quote, says, "We are accustomed to apply the term *re-eration* solely to the conversion of individuals; ereas its relation here is to the general state of gs. As they were wont to denominate *the creation* us, a remarkable restoration, or *renovation*, of the e of things, was very suitably termed *παλιγγενεσία*. e return of the Israelites to their own land, after Babylonish captivity, is so named by Josephus, Jewish historian. What was said on verse 23.

holds equally in regard to the promise we have here. The principal completion will be at the general resurrection, when there will be, in the most important sense, a *renovation*, or *regeneration* of heaven and earth, when all things shall become new; yet, in a subordinate sense, it may be said to have been accomplished when God came to visit, in judgment, that guilty land; when the old dispensation was utterly abolished, and succeeded by the Christian dispensation, into which the Gentiles, from every quarter, as well as Jews, were called and admitted." See also Whitby's note on Matth. 19: 27, 28. to the same effect.

It is obvious from these statements, that the passage has no reference to a future state of existence, but to the establishment of Jesus in the throne of his kingdom, when the Old Testament was utterly abolished, and from which period he has been judging the world in righteousness, and the people with his truth. He, as king, reigns in righteousness, and the apostles with him decree justice, and shall continue to do so until the period called *the end*, 1 Cor. 15: 24—28. when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God the father. Can the statements of these writers be proved false? Besides, the apostles and others are not to enjoy eternal life until the day of judgment, if this be the time Christ refers to by sitting on the throne of his glory. Is it objected—"Were not the disciples in the kingdom of Christ, and enjoying eternal life in the sense which you have explained it, at the time our Lord spoke?" Yes, but it was not until the Son of man came at the end of the Jewish age, that his kingdom came with power. See Luke 21: 31—34. Mark 8: 38. and 9: 1. At this time it was profitable for his disciples *to enter into life* with the loss of all things dear to them, rather than go into Gehenna or hell, or to suffer all the miseries which came on the Jewish

nation. See Mark 9 : 43—50. and the Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c.

4th. This view of eternal life, enjoyed in the world to come, is confirmed from the following context. Our Lord having said, "and shall inherit everlasting life," immediately adds, "but many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first." Here the chapter ends, but it is evident, the Saviour, in the beginning of the next chapter, goes on to illustrate his meaning by the parable commonly called the parable of the laborers in the vineyard. Well, let us ask the question, many that are first shall be last and the last shall be first, about what? The answer from the context evidently is, about inheriting everlasting life, or entering into the kingdom of God. Accordingly, our Lord says, "For the kingdom of heaven, (or inheriting everlasting life in it) is like unto a man who is an householder, who went out very early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard." This parable is interpreted by Macknight and others, of the calling of the Jews and Gentiles; for the Gentiles, who were the last in having the kingdom of God preached to them, were the first to enter into the kingdom of God, or enjoy eternal life in this kingdom; and the Jews, to whom it was first preached, shall be last in entering into the enjoyment of the same blessings. This must be understood of both Jews and Gentiles, generally, as a people.

5th. The view given of *eternal life*, will be confirmed, by attending to the general usage of this phrase in the New Testament. This must be done in a very brief way, for the texts are numerous where it occurs. The reader may consult the texts for himself; we shall give all the places where it is found, and shall propose some questions from them for his consideration. I find, then, *zoe*, rendered *life*, and used to ex-

press what we call *natural life*, 1 Cor. 3 : 22. James 4 : 14. Acts 8 : 33. Rom. 8 : 38. John 12 : 25. Acts 17 : 25. 1 John 5 : 16. Luke 1 : 75. Philip. 1 : 20. Acts 2 : 28. 1 Tim. 4 : 8. 1 Cor. 15 : 19. Rom. 7 : 10. Heb. 7 : 3. Acts 7 : 19. Luke 17 : 33. Luke 16 : 25. Rev. 11 : 11. It is also used to express the happiness, or the good a man enjoys in this life, Luke 12 : 15. 1 Peter 3 : 10. Luke 16 : 25. 2 Peter 1 : 3.

But I find *zoe*, life, used to designate that moral or spiritual life, enjoyed by believers in Jesus. Before believing, they are spoken of as alienated from the life of God, Eph. 4 : 18. In believing, they pass from death to life, 1 John 3 : 14, 15. They have repentance unto life granted to them, Acts 11 : 18. and obtain justification of life, Rom. 5 : 18. By the power of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus they are made free from the power of sin and death, Romans 8 : 2. Their spirits or minds are alive, because of righteousness, Rom. 8 : 10. and enjoy life and peace, verse 6. They have the light of life, John 8 : 12. Walk in newness of life, Rom. 6 : 4. and hold forth the word of life, Philip. 2 : 16. The meat Christ gave them endured to eternal life, John 6 : 27. and the water, a well springing up to everlasting life, John 4 : 14. They are exhorted to lay hold on eternal life, 1 Tim. 6 : 12, 19. and seek for glory, honor, immortality, eternal life, Rom. 2 : 7. And by sowing to the spirit reaped life everlasting, Gal. 6 : 8. They are exhorted to look for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life, Jude 21. Have their fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life, Rom. 6 : 22. The life of Jesus was made manifest in them, 2 Cor. 4 : 10—12. They were heirs of the grace of life, 1 Peter 3 : 7. Were saved by Christ's life, Rom. 5 : 10. and are said to reign in life, Rom. 5 : 17. The names of such persons are said to be in the book of life, Philip. 4 : 3. Rev. 3 : 5, 13 : 8. 17 : 8. 20 : 12.

15. 21: 27. and 22: 19. They drink of the water of life, John 4: 14. Rev. 21: 6. and 22: 1, 17. And by overcoming they were to eat of the tree of life, Rev. 2: 7. 22: 2, 14. and obtain a crown of life, James 1: 12. Rev. 2: 10. And mortality is at last to be swallowed up of life, 2 Cor. 5: 4. The gate which led to this life was strait and the way narrow, Matth. 7: 14. Several persons asked our Lord what they should do to obtain or inherit eternal life, Matth. 19: 16. Mark 10: 17. Luke 10: 25. and 18: 18. And it is evident from the context of all these passages, that to have eternal life, to enter into this life, and to enter into the kingdom of God, all referred to the same thing. See also Matth. 18: 8, 9. and 19: 17, 29. Mark 9: 43, 45.

It appears, that man never would have known any other life, except natural life, but for the grace of God through Jesus Christ. Christ hath brought life and immortality to light, 2 Tim. 1: 10. With a view to this, God promised eternal life, 1 John 2: 25. It was promised before the Jewish age began, Tit. 1: 2. This promise of life was in or by Christ Jesus, 2 Tim. 1: 1. This promise laid a foundation for the hope of it, Tit. 1: 2. and 3: 7. The father gave the son to have life in himself, John 5: 26. Hence it is said, in him was life, John 1: 4. And he was made after the power of an endless life, Heb. 7: 16. Accordingly he is called *the life*, 1 John 1: 2. John 14: 6. the resurrection and the life, John 11: 25. the eternal life, 1 John 5: 20. and the eternal life who was with the father and manifested to us, 1 John 1: 2. He is also termed the prince of life, Acts 3: 15. and the bread of life, John 6: 35, 48, 51, 53. The grace of God reigns through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ, Rom. 5: 21. and eternal life is the gift of God through Jesus Christ, Rom. 6: 23. This eternal life is in or by God's son, 1 John 5: 11. He

gives eternal life, John 10: 28. and gives it to as many as the father hath given him, John 17: 2. This eternal life is expressly said to consist in knowing God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, John 17: 3. Hence the words of Christ were spirit and life, John 6: 63. He had the words of eternal life, verse 68. God's commandment was life everlasting, John 12: 50. Comp. 1 John 1: 1. As eternal life consists in the knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, so persons are said to enjoy it by believing, John 3: 15, 16. 1 Tim. 1: 16. They had it upon their believing, and it abode in them by continuing to believe, John 3: 36. 5: 24. 6: 40, 47, 53, 54. and 20: 31. 1 John 5: 12, 13. The Jews thought that in their Scriptures they had eternal life, yet would not come to Christ, or believe on him, that they might have it, John 5: 39, 40. On the contrary, they judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life by rejecting the gospel, Acts 13: 46. Accordingly the apostles turned to the Gentiles, and as many of them as were ordained or disposed for eternal life, believed, verse 48. The Jews had all the words of this life preached unto them, Acts 5: 20. The apostles in preaching were to some a savour of life unto life, and to others of death unto death, 2 Cor. 2: 16. In reaping the gospel harvest among the Jews, they gathered fruit unto life eternal, John 4: 36. And whosoever lost his life for Christ's sake kept it unto life eternal, John 12: 25. for at the end of the age those who endured to the end were saved. Those who believed not went away into everlasting punishment and the righteous into life eternal, Matth. 25: 46. Comp. John 5: 29. And the receiving of the Jews again shall be as life from the dead, Rom. 11: 15.

Such is a very brief review of all the texts where life, and everlasting life are spoken of in the New Testament. On the whole of them I would now

propose a few queries and remarks. If eternal life refers to the happiness of heaven in a future state, how is it accounted for, that *eternal death* is never spoken of as its counterpart to the wicked in a future state? Everlasting punishment is mentioned, Matth. 25 : 46. as the counterpart of everlasting life, but everlasting or eternal death is not once named in the Bible. But it is well known that eternal death is a favorite expression with many preachers. But it may be said, "everlasting punishment, everlasting fire, everlasting destruction, are mentioned in the Bible, and are not these equivalent to eternal death?" We answer no; and it will be seen in the next Section that such expressions have no respect to punishment beyond this life. But again, if eternal life refers to the happiness of heaven in a future state, how happens it that it is so often spoken about as a thing enjoyed in this life, and dwelling in persons by believing in Jesus? It is defined to consist in knowing God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. It could not only be enjoyed here, but people could enter into this life, and is the same as entering into the kingdom of God. Further; though eternal life is sometimes spoken of as future, and an object of hope, yet I do not find it spoken of as an object expected after the resurrection of the dead, or once mentioned as equivalent to the happiness to be enjoyed in the resurrection state. It is rather spoken of as something expected after the end of the Jewish age, during the age of the Messiah, or the "world to come." The promise of eternal life in this age to come, was made to Christ's disciples; for when our Lord spoke, the old dispensation had not then vanished away, and it was not until it ended, that our Lord's kingdom came in its glory and power. It was a matter of hope to his disciples, for then they were to enter into life, or

into the joy of their Lord. But again, the term life is used both in the Old and New Testaments to express happiness or enjoyment. We have seen that it is used very often to designate the spiritual or moral life of believers. Those who believed were not condemned, did not perish, but were saved. Those who did not believe, of the Jewish nation, and those believers who did not endure to the end did perish.—The wrath of God abode on them, and his wrath came on them to the uttermost at the destruction of Jerusalem. The Jews, by putting the word of God from them, judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life. The apostles turned to the Gentiles, and thus the kingdom of God was taken from the Jews, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. I would only add that this eternal life is expressly said to be enjoyed *in the world to come*. This world or age to come, we are told by orthodox authors above, began at our Lord's first advent, and shall be completed at his second coming. How then is eternal life to be enjoyed if the world to come ends, according to their own explanation of this expression?

In regard to the word everlasting being associated with the term life it can occasion no serious difficulty. The term everlasting is also applied to the kingdom of Christ, and the gospel of this kingdom is called "the everlasting gospel." But surely no one ever thought that the gospel is to be preached to the endless ages of eternity. Is it said, "How could the apostles enjoy everlasting life in the kingdom of God here, seeing a few years terminates the existence of every man in this world?" I answer this by asking, how could Samuel abide before the Lord forever? Or how could the slave serve his master forever? In short, how could the priesthood be enjoyed by Aaron and his sons forever? Or the land of Canaan be an in-

heritance to Israel forever? But these remarks I have merely suggested for consideration. Allowing they have no weight, the grand subject of our investigation stands unaffected; for all must admit the remarkable fact, that frequent as eternal life is mentioned, yet no sacred writer ever ventured to speak of eternal death; and it is with the application of this word to future punishment we are at present chiefly concerned.

In Luke 20: 34—36. we have *this world*, and *that world* mentioned, or, this age and that age or state. But as it requires no particular consideration, it is unnecessary to transcribe it. I would only remark, that *aionos* here cannot mean endless duration or forever. It would not do to say the children of this forever marry, and the children of that forever do not marry.

SECTION VII.

ALL THE PLACES WHERE AION AND AIONIOS ARE USED TO
EXPRESS THE DURATION OF PUNISHMENT, PARTICULARLY
CONSIDERED, IN WHATEVER WAY RENDERED IN THE COM-
MON VERSION.

MATTH. 25: 46. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." See also verse 41. which refers to the same persons, and the same punishment. Before we proceed to consider these words directly, we beg

leave to make some general remarks on chapters 24. and 25. together.

1st. What is contained in these two chapters is one continued discourse of our Lord's addressed to his disciples. The word *then*, in verse 1. of chapter 25. shows this. "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins." When was the kingdom of heaven to be likened to this? The answer is found in chap. 24. which is, at the coming of Christ to destroy Jerusalem. It is further manifest from chap. 26: 1. "And it came to pass when Jesus had finished all these sayings." And what sayings could these be but all the sayings contained in the two chapters? For it will be difficult to point out any change of subject or interruption of our Lord's discourse, from verse 4. of chap. 24. to the end of chap. 25. That this discourse was delivered to the disciples alone, is plain from comparing chap. 24: 1—4. with chap. 26: 1, 2.

2d. The whole of this discourse is in answer to the questions put by the disciples, verse 3. of chap. 24. "Tell us when shall these things be? And what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world," or age? This supposes he had said something about his coming, which we find was the case from the last verse of chap. 23. The questions put, were to obtain information about this coming, and the signs whereby they might know its approach. All allow, that the coming, in chap. 24. refers to our Lord's coming at the end of the Jewish age or dispensation, but many contend that the coming in chap. 25. refers to his coming at a day of general judgment at the end of this world. But the word *then*, so clearly marks the connexion of these two chapters, as to forbid such a supposition. Nor can any man point out where our Lord left off speaking of the one coming, and began to speak of the other. He mentions his coming, chap.

24 : 3, 27, 30, 37, 39, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50. and in chap. 25 : 6, 10, 13, 19, 27, 31. as one : nor can any one doubt that the same coming, chap. 25 : 31. is the same as that, chap. 24 : 30—35. from the language used and the circumstances mentioned. See also Matth. 16 : 27, 28. Luke 9 : 26, 27. Mark 8 : 38. and 9 : 1. From verse 4. of chap. 24. our Lord proceeds to answer the disciples' questions, and points out particularly the signs whereby they might know that his coming was at hand. These I need not particularize.

3d. What has led many to conclude, that chap. 25. refers to a day of general judgment, is, overlooking the connexion between the two chapters, marked by the word *then*, in verse 1. of chap. 25. and not noticing how exactly the three parts of chap. 25. correspond to and illustrate three things inculcated on the disciples from verse 42. to the end of chap. 24. These I shall briefly notice, hoping the reader will compare the passages I refer to. Notice, then,

1st. That our Lord inculcates on his disciples the duty of *watchfulness*, in view of his coming. See chap. 24 : 42—44. Let the reader then compare these three verses with chap. 25 : 1—13. and we think he must be convinced, that the parable of the ten virgins was spoken to illustrate, and enforce on his disciples this very duty. Hence the parable ends with these words, expressive of its object—"Watch therefore ; for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh ;" which are almost the very words in which he stated the duty of watchfulness in chap. 24 : 43, 44. Who can dispute this? But admit it, and this part of Matth. 25. must be given up as referring to a day of general judgment at the end of this world.

2d. In chap. 24 : 45. our Lord also inculcates on his disciples the duty of *faithfulness*, in view of his

coming. Let the reader again compare the second division of chap. 25. from verse 14—31. and we think he must also be convinced, that the parable of the talents, was spoken by our Lord to illustrate and enforce the duty of faithfulness upon them. Here I ask every candid reader to say—Is it not the same Son of man which is mentioned in both chapters? Are not the servants to whom the goods were delivered the same as in chap. 24 : 45. ? Is not the faithfulness and unfaithfulness of the servants the same in both? And is not the coming of our Lord to reckon with them the same coming in both? Who can with any show of reason deny these things? But who can admit them, yet contend that this second part of chap. 25. has any relation to a day of general judgment?

3d. In verse 46. and to the end of chap. 24. our Lord states the consequences which would result, according as they were found watchful and faithful, or the contrary. Now compare this with the third division of chap. 25. from verse 31—46. and all must see how exactly the one corresponds to the other. In the one, he states what rewards and punishments would, at his coming, be awarded his servants : and in the other, he goes on to illustrate this, by what may as justly be called the parable of the rewards and punishments, as the two former are called the parables of the ten virgins and talents. This agreement of chaps. 24, 25. is not an accidental thing, but the effect of design, and clearly marked by the word *then*, with which chap. 25. begins; but it is not noticed by most readers as it ought, by the improper division of our Lord's discourse into chapters and verses. Our Lord no more ends his discourse, chap. 24. than Paul ends his Epistle to the Romans, chap. 4. If the question is asked, *when* shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins? The answer is

found in chap. 24: 42, 44, 46, 50. where his coming is repeatedly mentioned, and in verse 34. is expressly said to be during that generation. We ask every candid man, Is not the Son of man, mentioned chap. 25: 31. the very same Son of man as is spoken of in chap. 24? And is not his coming in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, the same coming and glory as is mentioned chap. 24: 30.? It was this perfect agreement of the three divisions of chap. 25. to the three things stated in chap. 24. which changed our views of this subject many years ago, so that our views of these two chapters are not influenced by any change of opinions since.

Keeping these general remarks in view, let us attend to the words—"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." The first question is—"Who shall go away into everlasting punishment?" The context answers, the goats, verse 33. whose conduct is described, verses 41—46. The wicked and slothful servants, verses 24—29. The foolish virgins, verses 10—12. And the evil servants, chap. 24: 48, 49.

2d. Let us ask the question—What everlasting punishment were these persons to go away into? Answer: the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels, verse 41. The outer darkness, verse 30. See also verse 10. and chap. 24: 51. all of which, it will be allowed, refer to the same punishment. In the first part of this Inquiry it has been shown, that by the devil and his angels, verse 41. our Lord referred to the unbelieving Jews and opposers of Christianity. In the Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c. it has been also shown, that *fire* is a figure often used in Scripture for temporal punishment, and is the same here, as *hell fire* in other places. In both Inquiries it has been shown, that the term *everlasting*, is applied to the punishment which the Jews are now enduring. In

confirmation of these things, comp. Luke 13 : 23—31. Matth. 8 : 11, 12. 13 : 42, 50. and 22 : 13.

3d. Let us ask again—When were these persons to go away into everlasting punishment? The answer from the context evidently is—“When the Son of man came in his glory,” verse 31. Well, when was this? Not at a day of judgment, for not a word is said about this in the two chapters. It was when the Lord of the servants came to reckon with them, verse 19. When the bridegroom came, verse 10. At the time when the slothful servants were not looking for him, chap. 24 : 41—51. And at the time referred to, verse 44. when he said to his disciples, “be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not, the son of man cometh.” Christ’s father only knew of this day, verse 36. It was to come like a thief in the night, or like the flood on the old world, verses 37, 43. But it was certainly to come during that generation, verse 34. Then he was to reward every man according to his works, which exactly agrees to some going away into everlasting punishment, and some into life eternal.

But it will be asked, What throne of glory did Christ sit on when he came to take vengeance on the Jewish nation at the end of the age? The Greek in chap. 25 : 31. is, *tote kathisei epi thronou doxes autou*, and is the same which Matthew used, chap. 19 : 28. and is rendered in both places by Dr. Campbell in the same way. The whole verse he renders thus—“Verily I say unto you, that at the renovation, when the Son of man shall be seated on his glorious throne, ye my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall judge the twelve tribes of Israel.” Here let the reader turn to the last Section, and read the quotations made from Dr. Campbell and Macknight on this verse. These writers have shown, that the coming of Christ was at the end of the Jewish dispensation, that the

throne on which he sat was the throne of his mediatorial kingdom, and the judging then to take place, the ruling or governing men with his truth. His throne was no more a literal, visible throne, than were the twelve thrones of the apostles. The time when, the nature of the throne, and similar language used in both cases by Matthew, show, that there is no reference to a day of general judgment, as is generally supposed. If Matthew used this language, chap. 19 : 28. as these writers explain it, by what fair rule of interpretation do we give the same words, chap. 25 : 31. such a very different interpretation? Men now would feel indignant at having their words interpreted in such an arbitrary and capricious manner. What right, then, has any man to affirm, that the Son of man's coming in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, refers to a day of general judgment, when the same writer, in the same book, has used the same or similar language, where it is manifest he is speaking of Christ's coming at the end of the Jewish age or dispensation? It is well known, that the term rendered angel, simply signifies a messenger of any kind: and it is allowed, on all hands, that angels are mentioned as connected with our Lord's coming at this period. See Matth. 24 : 30, 31. and 16 : 27. Mark 8 : 38. 9 : 1. and 13 : 26, 27. Luke 21 : 27. The angels being then mentioned, is a confirmation, not an objection to the views advanced. See Whitby and Macknight on Matth. 24. who show the angels to be human beings.

But it will be objected—How, upon your views, can it be said, “and before him shall be gathered all nations?” Answer; the phrase “all nations” occurs twice before in this very discourse of our Lord's, chap. 24 : 9, 14. “And ye shall be hated of *all nations* for my name's sake. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a

witness unto *all nations*, and then shall the end come." What end shall come? Evidently the end of the Jewish age, verse 3. which took place about forty years after our Lord delivered this discourse. During this period the gospel was preached among all nations, Mark 13 : 10. or throughout the Roman empire, which was then called the whole world, Luke 2 : 1. See Matth. 28 : 19, 20. Col. 1 : 6, 23. Rom. 1 : 8. and 10 : 18. Judea was then a province of the Roman empire. That the apostles preached the gospel throughout the Roman empire, and were hated of all nations, no one disputes. We have then found in this discourse, the *all nations* to be gathered before Christ seated on his mediatorial throne. It is obvious, that whoever contends for a literal gathering together of all nations before him, ought also to contend, that every individual of the same *all nations* heard the gospel, and that every individual of them hated the apostles for Christ's name sake. But how in this case could they have had any converts to their doctrine? And no separation could have taken place, for all the nations would have been goats. The gathering together of all nations before him, need not be extended to more than such as heard the gospel, and professed it, some of whom did, but others did not bring forth its proper fruits. This limited view, we think is favored by the scope of our Lord's discourse. For example, it was not the whole world, or all nations, but the *kingdom of heaven*, or Christ's professed disciples, who are likened unto the virgins, verse 1. Nor was it to all nations, but to his *own servants*, Christ delivered his goods, verse 14. See also chap. 24 : 42—46. And the replies made to the king by both goats and sheep, proceed on the ground that they were both professors of his name. But it is not absolutely necessary to confine the sense of this phrase; for, since Christ sat down on his glori-

ous throne, he has been judging the nations of the world in righteousness, and such of them as would not serve him, he has broken in pieces like a potter's vessel. But let us inquire,

1st. Were there any false professors in the kingdom of heaven when our Lord came at the end of the age. This needs no proof, for it is notorious, and universally admitted. There were foolish virgins, and servants who had not improved their talents. See also chap. 24 : 10—12. And see the epistles, for complaints made of professors by the apostles. When Christ came to reckon with his servants he found some faithful and watchful, but others saying, **my Lord delayeth his coming**, counting him an hard master, smiting their fellow servants, and eating and drinking with the drunken. When he ascended to God's right hand, he was like a man travelling into a far country to receive unto himself a kingdom. See Luke 19 : 12—27. At the end of the age, he returned, having received his kingdom, and called his servants to an account of their conduct during his absence. Before he went away, he commanded all to be faithful and watchful. But such was the state in which he found the kingdom of heaven when he returned. The whole slumbered and slept. Many were found neither looking for, nor prepared for his coming. He had forewarned them of the consequences, and this third division of chap. 25. sets forth the rewards and punishments which he then awarded to them. That much is said in the New Testament, to excite their hopes and fears relative to our Lord's coming at the end of the Jewish dispensation, no one, we think, will question. But where do we find what our Lord promised or threatened, fulfilled, but in this very discourse, and which goes to show that the view I have given of it is substantially correct?

2d. Did a separation take place at the end of the Jewish age, between true and false professors in the kingdom of heaven, or, between the goats and sheep? Nothing can be more certain. This separation is described under other figures, such as a separation between chaff and wheat, Matth. 3 : 12. Tares and wheat; and good and bad fishes; Matth. 13 : 30—43. See also Matth. 8 : 11, 12. and 16 : 27, 28. Christ's fan purged his floor. The net then was drawn to shore, and the good and bad fishes separated. The tares were gathered to be burned, and the wheat into the garner. Indeed, none but such as endured to the end were saved; Matth. 24 : 13. What is said about separating them as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, is in allusion to the business of a shepherd, and to Christ who is called the good shepherd, and his true disciples, sheep. His placing the sheep on the right hand, and the goats on the left, is probably in reference to judicial trials, as may be seen above in a quotation from Jahn. The rule of judgment was, offices of kindness performed or not performed towards Christ's disciples. The similarity of the language used, chap. 24 : 45, 46. and chap. 25 : 34—41. deserves the reader's notice. In the first it is "blessed is that servant whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing." And in the last "come ye blessed of my father inherit the kingdom," &c. Comp. 2 Tim. 1 : 15—18. and Rom. 16 : 3, 4. as actual examples of such kind offices performed.

3d. What everlasting punishment and eternal life did those persons go away into after this separation? 1st. What everlasting punishment did the goats go away into? The same as the everlasting fire, verse 41. which in the one verse is expressed figuratively, and in the other plainly. This everlasting fire was prepared for the devil and his angels, or the Jews, and the opposers of Christianity. To them was the Gos-

pel first preached ; by them it was first rejected, and for them this punishment is said to have been prepared. But observe, it is not, like the kingdom for the righteous, said to have been prepared from the foundation of the world. What then was the everlasting fire or punishment prepared for the Jews, the avowed enemies of Christ and his Gospel, for these false professors are said to go away into the same or similar punishment. I answer, the kingdom of God was taken from them ; and I shall show on 2 Thes. 1: 9. that they have been punished with everlasting destruction from *the presence of the Lord* in his worship and service. Blindness of mind, hardness of heart, and dreadful temporal judgments have come on the Jews for nearly eighteen hundred years. In the Jewish use of the term everlasting, it may well be called an everlasting fire or punishment. It is, then, agreeable to fact, that those of the kingdom of heaven not found watchful and faithful, or bringing forth the fruits of the Gospel, did go away into, or have suffered a similar punishment. Where are now the seven churches of Asia ? Indeed where is any church throughout what was then called the Roman empire ? Their candlestick is removed out of its place. Those nations have been given up to blindness of mind and hardness of heart very similar to the Jews, and that they have suffered severe temporal judgments none will deny. The most inveterate superstitions prevail among them. The nations who would not submit to him, or who have corrupted his religion after being favored with it, have suffered similar punishment, and it has been of such long continuance, that it may well be called everlasting. Christians who enjoy the gospel, tacitly allow, both Jews and heathen to be in a miserable condition, by their attempts to convert them to the faith of Christ. But after all the time and labor, and money spent to effect this,

the situation of those nations is not much more hopeful than that of the Jews. If there be any blessedness in believing the gospel, and being governed by the laws of Jesus, then there is misery in unbelief, superstition and wickedness; and both on a national and individual scale, the nation or individual in such a condition cannot but be miserable.

2d. But what life eternal did the righteous, or the sheep, go away into? As the everlasting punishment, verse 46. is the same as the everlasting fire, verse 41. so is the life eternal, verse 46. the same as the kingdom said to be prepared from the foundation of the world. What kingdom, then, was this? What kingdom could it be, but that which was taken from the Jews, and given to the Gentiles, called often the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God in the New Testament, and the kingdom likened unto the ten virgins, verse 1. The kingdom which Jesus went away to receive for himself when he ascended to the father, and on the throne of which he is represented as sitting, and calling his servants to an account when he returned. This kingdom is called the everlasting kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and does not consist in meat and drink, but in righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. That such a kingdom, or life eternal, was expected, is evident, for our Lord said, Luke 21: 31, 32. "When ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled." And verse 28. "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth near." This kingdom, or life eternal, might be said to be prepared for them from the foundation of the world, for it was included in the promise of Christ from the beginning.

It is an unsupported assertion, from any part of our Lord's discourse, that this kingdom, or the life eternal enjoyed by the righteous, is the happiness of the heavenly state. But the view I have given is amply supported both by it and other parts of Scripture. It is the same as going in with the bridegroom to the marriage, verse 10. And entering into the joy of their Lord, 21, 23. And to inherit this kingdom is to enjoy all the blessings and privileges of it. See Rom. 14 : 17. Matth. 8 : 11, 12. and Luke 22 : 29, 30. My views, then, accord with the nature of the kingdom Christ received from the father, the throne on which he sits, and his rule and government in it, and which, at the period called the end, he is to deliver up to God the father, 1 Cor. 15 : 24—28. To this kingdom he had a right to invite all those who endured to the end, chap. 24 : 13. and to punish all those who said, "we will not have this man to rule over us."

It has long been considered one of the strongest arguments in favor of eternal misery, that the same Greek word is rendered here *everlasting* and *eternal*, and applied both to life and punishment. It is hence inferred, that if the punishment is not endless, neither is life. Universalists do not admit this, for they adduce some texts where everlasting is used in the same sense, where it is allowed by their opponents that it is used both in a limited and unlimited sense. But if my views are found correct, it puts a final end to this argument and mode of reasoning, for everlasting is not used in either case to express endless duration. A brief sketch of my views of the phrase "everlasting-life," has been given above, and some things may just be noticed here in confirmation of them.

1st. It is concluded by many, that this chapter contains an account of the end of this world, and the day of judgment. But why is such a conclusion

drawn? for certainly, though it speaks of everlasting fire, everlasting punishment, and life eternal, it gives no intimation that these are suffered or enjoyed after death, or in another state of existence. The general usage of the word everlasting is against such a conclusion; and it is beyond all debate, that this term is applied in other texts to the temporal punishment of the Jews, which no one believes to be of endless duration. Besides, the whole scope of our Lord's discourse shows, that here the word everlasting is used to express the duration of this very punishment, and is the fulfilment of what Daniel predicted, chap. 12: 2. considered above. This is confirmed from the word *kolasis*, here rendered *punishment*. Parkhurst says it comes from *kolazo*, to punish, and it comes from *cla* in the Hebrew, which signifies *to restrain*. This punishment, then, is for the purpose of *restraining* the subjects of it, and not, as we are sometimes told, for "the glory of divine justice in their eternal misery;" or, that "the happiness of the righteous may be sweetened in seeing the smoke of their torment ascend up forever and ever." The sense given by Parkhurst to the above words is supported by their Scripture usage. See 1 John 4: 18. Acts 4: 21. 2 Peter 2: 9. On this last text see my answer to Mr. Sabine. The word rendered punishment in both places, is a confirmation of my opinions.

2d. The life eternal, verse 46. and the kingdom the righteous are called to inherit, verse 34. are the same, or the life eternal is to be enjoyed in this kingdom. It has then been shown above, that eternal life was promised to Christ's disciples in *the world to come*, or the age of the Messiah, which certainly agrees to this passage. This passage is the fulfilment of what Christ promised, Mark 10: 30. Luke 18: 30. Matth. 19: 29. considered above. The father ap-

pointed to Christ a kingdom, and he having returned from receiving it, his faithful followers enjoyed the life or happiness of it. They entered into the joy of their Lord, and shone forth like the sun in the kingdom of their father.

It may be objected—"How could it be said, 'these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal,' if endless duration in a future state be not meant, for such persons could only live a few years in this world either to suffer or enjoy?" See this objection noticed page 310. I would add here, that it is certain, everlasting is applied in Scripture both to punishment and enjoyment, when all allow endless duration is not meant. Why not so here, when we have seen that eternal life was to be enjoyed in *the world to come*, which is to end? That the present punishment of the Jews is called everlasting, no one can dispute, and we think has been shown, is the punishment referred to in this very passage. If the Jews, while in Canaan, enjoyed it successively in their generations as an everlasting possession, and now cast out of it, endure in their generations an everlasting punishment, why not also believers enjoy eternal life, in a similar way, in the age of the Messiah? This life, I conceive, is not called eternal on account of its endless enjoyment by the individuals, but from its being a life connected with the kingdom of Christ, which is called an everlasting kingdom, which is to endure until the end, or resurrection of all the dead, and then mortality shall be swallowed up of life in being forever with the Lord. It is everlasting in a similar sense as the kingdom itself, or the gospel of this kingdom, which is called the everlasting gospel.

Is it further objected—"That Matth. 24. has a double meaning, first, in the destruction of Jerusalem during that generation, and second, in the dissolution

of this world and a day of general judgment?" But why not give it twenty meanings and accomplishments as well as two? And why not say the same of all the discourses which our Lord delivered? Our Lord declared "All these things shall come on this generation," but did he intimate that they were again to be fulfilled in a still higher sense at a day of general judgment? No, nothing like this is said by him; and without proof, such an objection does not require a serious refutation. At any rate, let the evidence for this be produced, and we shall give it a serious consideration.

2 Thess. 1 : 9. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." We have considered this passage, with its context, very fully in the Universalist Magazine, vol. v. beginning at page 157. To it we refer the reader, and shall here only give an abridgment of our remarks. Let us consider,

1st. Who the persons were to whom Paul alluded when he said, "*who* shall be punished with everlasting destruction." Most people say—"All the wicked." The apostle and the Thessalonians knew who they were to their painful experience, for they were the persons who *troubled* them, verse 6, and from whom their persecutions arose, verse 4. Who, then, *persecuted* and *troubled* them? The Thessalonians were persecuted by their own countrymen, 1st Epist. chap. 2 : 14, 15. But their persecutions chiefly arose from the unbelieving Jews, as is evident from Acts 17 : 5—7. Comp. 1 Thess 2 : 15. The whole New Testament shows this. But it is evident from the context. Let the question be asked—Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction? The answer is found, verse 8. Those "that know not God, and obeyed not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Was not this the case with the Jews? Comp. John

16 : 3. God was to recompense tribulation, and to take vengeance on those that knew not God; and God's vengeance on the Jews is expressly called—"the days of *vengeance*, that all things which are written may be fulfilled," Luke 21 : 22. Comp. also Luke 18 : 7, 8. Rom. 12 : 19. The connexion between the 8th and 9th verses clearly shows, that the vengeance to be taken on them that know not God, and who shall be punished with everlasting destruction, refers to the same persons, and the same punishment. And in verse 6. it is said, it is a righteous thing with God "to recompense *tribulation* to them;" and which our Lord calls, Matth. 24 : 29. "*great tribulation*, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." Comp. verse 21. By troubling or persecuting Christians, the Jews were to fill up the measure of their iniquity, and bring upon themselves such tribulations. Accordingly, it is said, verse 5. "which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God." What is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God? The answer is, verse 4. the persecutions and tribulations which the Thessalonians endured. But this only provokes the question—A manifest token of the righteous judgment of God upon whom? The answer evidently is, verse 6. upon them that troubled the Thessalonians, which we think beyond all dispute, were the unbelieving Jews. Comp. Philip. 1 : 28. where it is called "an evident token of perdition" to them. By pursuing such a course, the Jews fulfilled what our Lord predicted, and brought upon themselves all the righteous blood shed upon the earth. See Matth. 23 : 34—36. and 1 Thess. 2 : 16.

2d. Let us now consider *at what time* such persons were to be punished with everlasting destruction. If the persons were the unbelieving Jews, the answer is given already in the above remarks. It was at the

destruction of Jerusalem. But let us examine the context and we shall see this confirmed. The particular time specified is, "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven." Well, when was this to be? It is answered by the context, when he recompensed tribulation to the Jews who were the troublers of the Thessalonians, and was not this at the end of the age, when God's wrath came upon them to the uttermost? This period is expressly called, *the day when the son of man is revealed*, Luke 17: 30. comp. Rom. 2: 5. 1 Peter 1: 5, 13. 4: 13—19. and 5: 1—5. This revelation is said to be "from heaven," and the angels are said to be connected with it, which exactly corresponds to what is said, Matth. 24: 30, 31. It has been shown that the term fire is used as a figure to express God's judgments on the Jewish nation. See Mal. 4: 1. &c. But there are some things mentioned in the context which were to take place at the same time, "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven," which are irreconcilable with the common views entertained of this passage, but which strongly confirm the explanation I have given of it.

1st. At this same time the Thessalonians were to obtain *rest*, for it is said, "and to you who are troubled, rest with us, *when* the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven." The rest referred to was evidently rest from the persecutions they were enduring. See the context, and compare 2 Cor. 7: 5. and Acts 9: 31. If the day of judgment be the time referred to, then the Thessalonians are not to obtain rest from their persecutions until it arrives. But surely this cannot be, for the day of judgment is not yet come, and they have long ago found rest where all the weary find rest, and hear no more the voice of the oppressor. Did the Thessalonians then find rest at the period when Jesus was revealed to take vengeance on the Jewish nation? Yes; this is a matter of his-

tory as well as fact. Our Lord, referring to this very period, said to his disciples, "When these things begin to come to pass, then lift up your heads for your redemption draweth nigh," Luke 21 : 28. Those who endured to the end, were not only saved from the calamities which came on the Jews, but the Christians were at rest from their persecutions throughout the Roman empire. They were too much in trouble themselves then, to trouble others.

2d. It is obvious that the Thessalonians were to obtain rest at the same time that God was to recompense tribulation to their troublers or persecutors. This is plain from ver. 6, 7. quoted together: "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled rest with us." And when were both these to take place? It is immediately added, "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven." If the end of this world be referred to, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, it is a plain case, that God is not to recompense tribulation to those who troubled the Thessalonians until this period, nor until then are the Thessalonians to obtain rest. But the common belief is, that the wicked are punished from the moment of their death until the day of judgment, and are to be punished forever after it. The common view of this text therefore must be abandoned.

3d. But the time when all this was to take place, is further designated, verse 10. which Macknight renders thus: "*in that day* when he shall come to be glorified through his saints, and to be admired *by all the believers*; and by you, because our testimony was believed by you." Was Christ glorified then through his saints when he yielded vengeance on the Jews, in the destruction of their city and temple? We presume no one questions this. They obtained rest, they

lifted up their heads, and shone forth like the sun in the kingdom of their father. If believers glorified God, when Saul, the persecutor, was converted to the faith (Galations 1 : 23, 24.) how much more when they saw their persecutors generally removed, and "the son of man coming in his kingdom," Matth. 16 : 28. comp. Rev. 15 : 3, 4. and 11 : 17. But all these things will be confirmed by considering

3d. The *nature* and *duration* of the punishment here mentioned. 1st. Let us notice the *nature* of the punishment. It is called *destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power*. It will not be disputed, that the punishment described in these words, is the same as the righteous judgment of God, mentioned verse 5. and called tribulation, verse 6. and the vengeance to be yielded, verse 8. Nor will it be questioned, that the punishment described in all these verses is to be inflicted on the same persons. They are to be *punished*, and punished with *everlasting destruction*, yea, with everlasting destruction from *the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power*. It is easily perceived, that a correct understanding of the nature of the punishment depends on the meaning of the phrase

Presence of the Lord. What then is the scriptural sense of this expression? It may just be observed, that the phrases *face of God*, and *face of the Lord*, are the same in Scripture as *presence of God*, and *presence of the Lord*. By the *presence of God*, or *presence of the Lord* in Scripture, is sometimes meant his being every where present. Thus David says, Psalm 139 : 7, 8. "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven thou art there; if I make my bed in hell (Sheol) behold thou art there," &c. Admitting, for argument's sake, that hell is a place of endless punishment, how could the wicked even there be out of God's pres-

ence? Yet in this passage the persons are said to be punished with everlasting destruction *from the presence of the Lord*. Again; I find the phrase *presence of the Lord* refers to heaven, or the dwelling-place of the Most High. Christ is said to have gone "into heaven, now to appear *in the presence of God* for us." Heb. 9 : 24. And it is said, Luke 1 : 19. "I am Gabriel, that stand *in the presence of God*." But how could the wicked be punished with everlasting destruction from God's presence in this sense? For surely no one will say that they ever were in heaven, and like Gabriel stood in the presence of God. But again, the phrases *face of God*, or *presence of the Lord*, refers to some places where people met to worship him, and where he met with and manifested himself to them. Thus Jacob, at Penuel, Gen. 32 : 30. says, "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." See Job 1 : 6—12. and 2 : 1—7. for examples of the same phrase, *presence of the Lord*. Unless there was some particular place where God was manifested in the days of Cain, how could it be said, "and Cain went out *from the presence of the Lord* and dwelt in the land of Nod (or vagabond, as in the margin) in the east of Eden?" Gen. 4 : 16. and verse 14. it is added by Cain, "behold thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth : and from thy face shall I be hid."

It is very evident, that *the presence of the Lord* was in a peculiar manner among the children of Israel. See Exod. 33 : 14—17. comp. Isai. 63 : 9. and Psalm 51 : 11. The tabernacle in the wilderness, and the temple at Jerusalem, were considered by the Jews as the peculiar residence of Jehovah. There he abode, and there they performed all their religious services to him. Jehovah was the God of the Jews; their land his land, and the temple there was considered the place of his immediate presence. As this has an important bearing on the passage

before us, we must give it a little more of our attention. In the temple at Jerusalem, God is said to dwell between the cherubims, Psalm 80. The show bread placed there, is called "the loaves of the presence or faces." And viewed in this light, the following texts have great beauty and force. "Let us come before his presence with thanksgiving, and make a joyful noise unto him with psalms. Serve the Lord with gladness, come before his presence with singing. Glory and honor are in his presence; strength and gladness are in his place." Psalm 95: 2. and 100: 2. 1 Chron. 16: 27. But that the land of Judea, and particularly the temple, was considered by the Jews as the place of God's peculiar presence, is manifest from Jonah 1: 3. "But Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish, from the presence of the Lord." Where he believed the Lord's presence to be, we learn from chap. 2: 4. "I am cast out of thy sight; but I will look again toward thy holy temple." In short, whether the Jews were in their own land, or in captivity, when they prayed or performed acts of worship to their God, their thoughts and their faces were directed towards their temple at Jerusalem. See in proof of this, Dan. 6: 10. 1 Kings 8. Psalm 5: 7.

But there are still some passages which deserve our particular notice, because they clearly decide, what is the meaning of the phrase, *presence of the Lord*, in the passage before us. The first is, 2 Kings 13: 23. "And the Lord was gracious unto them, and had compassion on them, because of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and would not *destroy* them, neither *cast them from his presence as yet*." This was spoken of the Jews; and just notice, that God speaks of *destroying them*, and *casting them from his presence*. What he here says, that *as yet* he would not do to this people, in the following passage we find that he did do. 2 Kings 24: 20. "For through the

anger of the Lord, it came to pass in Jerusalem and Judah until he had *cast them out from his presence*, that Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon." The same is repeated, Jer. 52: 3. which I need not transcribe. God's presence was enjoyed by the Jews in Judea, and in their temple service. To be cast out of God's presence, is to be banished from Judea into captivity, and from all the privileges which the Jews enjoyed in their land, and temple worship. This was the same as *destroying them*. They were thus destroyed, or cast out of God's presence, for seventy years in their captivity at Babylon. But they were brought back from this captivity, and again enjoyed God's presence in their own land. At the time Paul wrote the words before us, the time was drawing near when they were to be again cast out of God's presence, and dispersed among all nations. Of the Jews Paul spoke. He adopts the very language of the above passages, used in speaking of their former captivity, to describe the judgments of God which awaited them in their being cast out of their land, their city and temple destroyed, and they destroyed with an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord. The Jews now, are just as certainly *destroyed from the presence of the Lord*, as they were during their seventy years captivity. How then can any man affirm, that Paul in this passage, by destruction from the presence of the Lord, meant either annihilation or eternal misery? If the Scriptures are allowed to interpret themselves, Paul only describes the temporal destruction and banishment of the Jews, and in the very language by which the prophets had described their former punishments. It is added by the apostle, "and from the glory of his power," or, as some render it, "his glorious power." Should this be understood of Jehovah the God of Israel, it is certain his glorious power was displayed among the

Jews. Should it be understood of Christ, it agrees with what is said of him; for at the destruction of Jerusalem he is said to have come in the glory of his father; and he was then to be seen coming with power and great glory, Matth. 16: 27. and 24: 30. But it will be said, How is this destruction of the Jews called an *everlasting* destruction from the presence of the Lord, if it refers merely to temporal calamities? I shall now,

2d. Notice the duration of their punishment. It is the word *everlasting*, which is here and in other places applied to punishment, which leads many good people to conclude, that it is in another world, and is of endless duration. But so far from this being true, on examination it will be found, that this very application of the word *everlasting*, is a strong confirming circumstance in proof of the views we have advanced; for, 1st. It has been shown at length, that *olim*, *aion*, and *aionios*, are rendered everlasting, and in a great many instances at least, are used to express a limited duration of time. But, 2d. These words are rendered everlasting, and applied to the very temporal punishment which the Jews have endured for eighteen hundred years, and are still enduring. For example, it is said, Jer. 23: 39, 40. "Therefore, behold, I, even I, will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you and your fathers, *and cast you out of my presence: and I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten.*" See my Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c. on this passage. Comp. also Deut. 28: 37. and 31: 17, 18. Hosea 9: 17. Jer. 20: 11. and 24: 9. What only remains to be accounted for is, why is this temporal punishment of the Jews called everlasting, both by the prophet, and by Paul in this passage? This we think is easily and rationally accounted for. Paul was a Jew, and

was speaking of Jews, and their punishment. What could be more proper, than to speak of their punishment in the language in which it was described by their own prophets, as a destruction, and an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord? The Jews were familiar with the language of their Scriptures; but what Jew ever understood, that to be cast out of God's presence, was to be cast into misery in a future state; or, that the word everlasting, applied to it, expressed its endless duration? No man, we think, will assert this. It is of no consequence how Christians have understood either the phrase, *presence of the Lord*, or the word *everlasting*, for ages past, but the question is—How did the Jews understand this language? In the Jewish use of the term everlasting, their present punishment is called everlasting with stricter propriety of language, than many other things to which they were accustomed to apply it. No punishment they ever suffered before is called everlasting, which might have been done to their seventy years captivity, for this term, we have seen, expresses the duration of a man's life. Should the present punishment of the Jews, then, end tomorrow, its continuance for eighteen hundred years might be called everlasting. But how long it is yet to continue, God only knows. For this length of time they have been cast out of their land, and have not enjoyed God's presence. The Christian church is God's house now, but how few Jews have come to enjoy his presence here, facts show. All the exertions made to convert them to the gospel of Christ, is little else than lost labor. The veil is on their hearts, and all attempts to remove it have as yet proved abortive. They are *an everlasting reproach*, and a *perpetual shame* among all the nations of the earth. What nation ever suffered so long and severe a destruction as they have done, yet remain a distinct and numerous

people? And what nation ever enjoyed such privileges, and yet remain so long a blinded and unbelieving people? But their punishment is to end; for as certainly as God has concluded them all in unbelief, so he is to have mercy upon all. Their everlasting destruction is not of endless duration.

1st. Is it objected—"How could the Jews, who persecuted Christians at Thessalonica, suffer this punishment, seeing they lived so far distant from Jerusalem?" Answer; it could have made no difference in the case, had they lived at the poles; for at the destruction of Jerusalem the Jews were banished Judea, and have not been allowed to return to this day. Even the few Jews in Judea now, do not enjoy the presence of the Lord. They live there without a temple, an altar, or a sacrifice, and mourn over the long desolations of their city and temple; dragging out a miserable existence in hopeless expectation that their Messiah is yet to come. But the probability is, that many of the Jews suffered at the destruction of their city and temple, for it was at the feast of the passover when they were generally assembled there, that Titus surrounded the city and they could not escape.

2d. Is it objected—"The presence of the Lord means his gracious presence at the day of judgment, and being destroyed from his presence, being banished to hell at this period?" Answer; let this be proved, for assertions prove nothing. Not a word is said in the whole context of the passage, about *a day of judgment* or *God's gracious presence*. Such gratuitous assertions do not deserve notice, and especially in view of the illustrations of this expression given from the Scriptures.

3d. Is it objected—"Your views of this passage do not agree with the coming of Christ mentioned chap. 2: 1. of this epistle; for it is his coming at the

day of judgment, and you have interpreted his coming in chap. 1. of his coming at the destruction of Jerusalem?" Answer; whoever will consult Whitby may see, that he interprets Christ's coming in chap. 1. of the day of judgment, but passes it very slightly; but he enters at large into the proof, that Christ's coming, chap. 2. refers to his coming to destroy Jerusalem. Whitby then shows, that chap. 2. is in accordance with my views of chap. 1. But whoever wishes to see these things treated more at large, must consult the Magazine referred to above.

Matth. 18 : 8. The "everlasting fire" here mentioned, is the same as hell fire, verse 9. for they are used as convertible expressions; and the same as everlasting fire, Matth. 25 : 41—See Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c. for an illustration of this text, and which has been also noticed in the present Inquiry. It requires no further attention.

Jude 7. "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them; in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." That the suffering the vengeance of eternal fire here, has no reference to punishment in a future state, appears to me evident from the following considerations. 1st. From comparing 2 Peter 2 : 6. where nothing is said about eternal fire, but only that the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, with the people together, are said to be condemned with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly. Had the people gone to endless misery, would Peter have omitted this important part, and mentioned only the destruction of the cities with the loss of their lives, as an example to ungodly men? We cannot very readily admit this. 2d. By comparing verses 5, 6, 7. together, Jude says, that the people to whom he wrote

knew that Sodom and Gomorrah suffered the vengeance of eternal fire. But I ask how they could know that they suffered in a future state of existence? For the history of the event, nor any other part of Scripture could give them such information. Comp. Zeph. 2 : 9. But they could know, that the people of Sodom and Gomorrah suffered temporal misery, for this is plainly made known. 3d. Jude says they were set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. But how could they be an example if this refers to punishment in a future state? For an example to others must be visible to be of any benefit to them. Their destruction with the cities, are an example, for these are facts allowed by sacred and profane writers, Jewish and heathen. See Philo, Josephus, the Apocryphal writers, and others, who all mention those events. It is allowed by many intelligent men, that nothing is said in the Old Testament about eternal punishment. The cities of the plain burnt for many ages, which sufficiently entitled this fire to be called "the vengeance of eternal fire." This fire might be called *eternal*, in the same or similar sense, as the desolation of certain cities and places were to be perpetual or everlasting. See among others the following places. Ezek. 26 : 20, 21. 35 : 9. Jer. 18 : 15, 16. 23 : 40. and 51 : 39. This has been shown above. I may add, that *purcs aienicu* might be rendered "of the fire of the age." The apostle then says, that they suffered the vengeance of the fire, or punishment of the age; fire being a figure for punishment. Or simply, they suffered the vengeance of the fire of old. 4th. Whitby and others, who believed the devil to be a real being, maintain, that he is not suffering, nor will suffer the torments of hell until after the day of judgment. Why then send the Sodomites there before him? God must be very merciful to the devil, to excuse him so long

a time from eternal misery, yet send all the Sodomites there when he burnt up their city. But we think neither the doctrine concerning the devil, nor eternal misery, have been properly examined, or such opinions would all be discarded.

Jude 13. "Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." Peter states for substance the same, 2d epist. 2 : 17. which has been noticed in my answer to Mr. Sabine, to which I refer the reader. There it has been shown that the apostle referred to the Jews, and the darkness they are now in; and that it may be said to be forever, in the Jewish usage of this expression. That their present punishment is called everlasting, we think has been proved from several texts above.

Mark 3 : 29. has been considered in connexion with Matth. 12 : 31, 32. above, and requires no further notice.

Heb. 6 : 2. "Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." It requires no proof, that Paul was addressing himself to believing Hebrews. At verse 11. of chapter 5. he said, that he had many things to say to them concerning Melchisedec, hard to be uttered, or not easily understood by them, because they were dull of hearing, or slow in learning. Accordingly, in verses 12—14. he reproveth them thus : "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil."

By the oracles of God, Paul evidently referred to the Old Testament scriptures, particularly the law given at Sinai. See Acts 7: 38. and Rom. 3: 2. He could not refer to the New Testament scriptures, for at the time he wrote they were not all written; nor does it appear that this appellation is ever applied to them. By the *first principles* must be meant, some things in the Old Testament, for they are said to be the *first principles of the oracles of God*. This is evident from the word *stoiheia*, rendered, first principles, Gal. 4: 3. 9. where instead of *elements* in the text, our translators have put *rudiments* in the margin. In Col. 2: 8. 20. they have rendered this same word *rudiments*, and have put *elements* in the margin. The same word is rendered *elements*, 2 Peter 3: 10. 12. which we think could be shown, refers to things belonging to the Jewish dispensation. It is apparent from these texts that it signifies the elements, rudiments, or first principles of the oracles of God, or, things which belonged to the Jewish dispensation. These were suited to the world, while in a state of childhood. But after Christ had come, ought to have been laid aside. But many Jewish converts to Christianity turned back again to these weak and beggarly elements, whereunto they deserved again to be in bondage. This was the case with the believing Hebrews: for instead of being in advance of the Gentile converts, having had the *rudiments* in their hands from their childhood, they needed even to be taught again which be the first principles of the oracles of God. They were babes, preferring milk to strong meat, or those rudiments, to being skilful in the word of righteousness, and having their senses exercised to discern both good and evil. See chap. 5: 12—14. and comp. Gal. 4: 1—4.

Let us now notice the two first verses of chap. 6.
 “Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of

Christ, let us go on unto perfection.” In the margin it is, “*therefore leaving the word of the beginning of Christ,*” which evidently refers to the first principles of the oracles of God, ch. 5 : 12. the word *therefore* shows that the apostle drew his inference from what he had just stated, chap. 5 : 12—14. It could not refer to the word of the beginning of Christ, taught by him or his apostles, for surely Paul would not command them to leave what Christians are commanded to hold fast and continue in. See 1 John 2 : 24. 1 Cor. 15 : 1—4. Nor, was this the beginning of the word of Christ, unless we affirm that nothing is said of Christ in the Old Testament. But to him gave all the law and the prophets witness. Besides, could the apostle mean to tell the Hebrews, that they could not go on unto perfection unless they left the beginning of the word of Christ? This we think is impossible. But, by leaving the first principles of the oracles of God as taught in the Old Testament, they could only go on to perfection, for it was by adhering to those rudiments after Christ had come, that their progress in knowledge had been retarded. Instead of *leaving* them, they began to lay them again as a foundation, or, returned to those weak and beggarly elements, deserving again to be in bondage to them. Is it asked, How can the different articles here specified, and which they are desired not to lay again as a foundation, be the first principles of the oracles of God, as taught in the Old Testament? I shall now attempt to show this by briefly noticing those articles.

1st. “*Not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works.*” That repentance was required under the Old Testament dispensation needs no proof, and therefore this part occasions no difficulty. Probably a reference is here made to that which was enjoined on the great day of atonement, Lev. 16 : 21, 22, 29, 30.

2d. “*And of faith towards God.*” But why not faith

towards Christ, if the apostle did not refer to the principles of the Old Testament? It is well known that the faith of persons during that dispensation chiefly respected God. See Heb. 11 : 6. John 14 : 1. This part can occasion no difficulty.

3d. "*Of the doctrine of baptisms.*" Christian baptism is always spoken of in the singular. But, when the Jewish baptisms or washings are mentioned in the New Testament, they are spoken of as here in the plural number. See as examples (in the Greek) Mark 7 : 4. 8. And Paul, in this very epistle, chap. 9 : 10. calls them *divers baptisms*. This so plainly belongs to the Old Testament, that we may conclude all the other things refer to the same dispensation.

4th. "*And of laying on of hands.*" This article can occasion no difficulty, for it is well known that laying on of hands was common under the Jewish dispensation, and that on various occasions. It is no objection to my view, that this and some of the other things were also done under the gospel dispensation.

5th. "*Of the resurrection of the dead.*" This is commonly understood of the general resurrection. But why should it? If the preceding articles refer to things under the old dispensation, why not this and the article which follows? Then, certain persons were raised from the dead, and that the apostle refers to them in chap. 11 : 35. is indisputable. Elijah raised the widow's son of Zarephath, 1 Kings 17 : 20—24. Elisha raised the Shunamite's son, 2 Kings 4 : 32—36. These with other instances of the power of God, were a great confirmation of the truth of Judaism, and confirmed the faith of believers in it; yea, exhibited the excellency of faith in God during that dispensation. Comp. Heb. 11. 35. with 1 Kings 17 : 24. And whatever promoted their faith toward God, led to repentance from dead works. But, that the term *anastasis* rendered *resurrection*, was used among the Jews


to express a revival in various ways, is shown by Dr. Campbell, previously quoted. The restoration of Israel is described as raising dead dry bones to life, Ezek. 37: 1—14. And with equal propriety might the deliverance of Israel from the bondage of Pharaoh be called a resurrection from the dead. Hence they said to Moses, Exod. 14: 11. "because there were no graves in Egypt hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?" That by the dead, in Scripture we are sometimes to understand not those actually dead, but only being in danger of it. And a deliverance out of such a state, a resurrection, is allowed. See among other texts the following: Genesis 20: 3. 2 Sam. 19: 28. 2 Cor. 1: 8—10. Rom. 11: 15. John 5: 28, 29.

6th. "*And of eternal judgment.*" That the term judgment is used to express *temporal* judgment in Scripture needs no proof, for this is obvious from many places. That the ancient Jewish religion was established by great temporal judgments is indisputable, as the five books of Moses show. And that the judgment of God on the Egyptians, when Israel were delivered from their bondage, is called *eternal* or *forever*, is expressly declared. Hence it is said, Exod. 14: 13. "For the Egyptians whom ye have seen to-day, ye shall see them again no more *forever*." See above on the word *olim*, as used in the Old Testament. Accordingly the phrase *krimatos aioniou*, eternal judgment, may be rendered, of the judgment of the age, or, the judgment of old. In this sense we have seen *olim*, *aion*, and *aionios* used in Scripture. I may just add, that the following context seems to confirm the view given of this passage. In verse 3. it is said, "*and this will we do if God permit.*" Do what? Let it be asked—Answer; "go on unto perfection," as stated verse 1. If the first principles, spoken of were such as belonged to the Old Testament, it was alto-

gether unnecessary for Paul to teach them, for this would be laying them again as a foundation. But it was highly proper for him to go on to teach what would render them perfect or full grown men, seeing they were so deficient in the knowledge of Christ Jesus. This in fact he did in this very epistle, for a great part is spent in pointing out to them the reality of that, of which the Jewish law was but a shadow. But what was to prevent his doing this for he says, "this will we do if God permit." This Paul purposed to do, if God gave him opportunity, and if his purpose and labors were not frustrated, by their total apostasy from the faith before his letter came to them. Hence his fears about this in verses 4-9. See also chap. 10: 23-39.

Rev. 14: 11. "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night." And 19: 3. "And again they said, Alleluia, and her smoke rose up forever and ever." And 20: 10. "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." It would be idle to show that these passages have no respect to punishment in another state of existence. No well informed man would urge them as proof of such a doctrine; for it is plain, that the punishments were in this world, where the time is measured by day and night.

Such are all the texts in the Bible, where *olim*, *aion*, and *aionios* are used, in whatever way rendered by our translators. Not one text has been omitted to our knowledge, and the reader having the whole ground before him, may examine it for himself. The texts on which dependence is placed, proving the doctrine of endless punishment, we have fully considered, and to spend time with others is unnecessary.



SECTION VIII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS ON OLIM, AION, AND AIONIOS, RENDERED EVERLASTING, FOREVER, &c. THROUGHOUT THE BIBLE, WHETHER APPLIED TO GOD, TO LIFE, OR PUNISHMENT.

If these terms are ever used to express endless duration, all seem to be agreed that they express the endless duration,

1st. *Of God.* Indeed, it is from their being applied to him, who is without beginning or end, that it is concluded they express endless duration when applied to other things. This point, then, requires to be examined with modesty and care. It would ill become me, to speak with dogmatical confidence on such a subject. All I claim is, that what has occurred to me be considered impartially, and it may lead to a more complete investigation of the subject. There is no dispute, nor can there be any, about the endless existence of Jehovah. The only point about which a question arises is, are these terms intended to express his endless duration when so applied? If they do, it must, I think, be allowed, that it is the subject to which they are applied which gives them this extent of signification; and it is certain beyond a doubt, that they are often used in Scripture to express a limited duration; yea, sometimes a short period, such as a person's life time. Besides, does it fairly follow, that because God is infinite, that words must derive an infinite signification when applied to him? If they do, why confine it to the words before us? Why not also say, that when the term *good* is applied to God, it must always mean an infinite degree of goodness? which if true, puts an end

to the doctrine of eternal misery, for it is expressly said "the Lord is *good* unto all." So in regard to other terms being applied to him. But what leads me to think that *olim*, *aion*, and *aionlos*, used to express duration when applied to the divine being, were not intended to designate his endless duration, are the following things :

1st. From the original native sense of these terms. Lexicon writers seem to be agreed, that they signify eternity, not from their natural native sense, but from the subjects to which they are applied, and the sense of certain passages requiring such an application of them. They all allow, that they not only signify limited duration, but are used to express this in Scripture. I would therefore query, whether we ought to take it for granted, that certain passages in which such words are used, require us to understand them as expressing endless duration? May not these passages be misunderstood? And, when duly considered, we may see that they do not require such a sense affixed to these terms. Is it correct reasoning to infer, that terms expressing limited duration, cannot be applied to God without changing their meaning from a limited to an infinite signification? Why may not these terms, which are certainly used to express all the ages of the world from its beginning to its end, be also used when applied to God, to express, not his endless duration, but the period of his dispensations and dealings with men through Jesus Christ, throughout all the generations of it. For example, when God is called "the king eternal," we have seen above, by a quotation from Macknight, that it simply signifies king of the ages, or of all the ages or dispensations of this world.

2d. Supposing then these terms when applied to God, do not express, his endless duration but all the period of his dispensations with men in this world,

there is a propriety and congruity in all their applications throughout the Scriptures. They are then used, to express a longer or shorter period, as the subject of the writer required. They express the period of a man's life-time, the duration of any one of the dispensations under which men have been placed, or all the ages of the world from its beginning to its end. Accordingly these terms are used in a variety of ways to express limited duration, as is universally allowed. To understand them as expressing endless duration would make the inspired writers in many instances speak the most palpable absurdities and contradictions.

3d. If these terms when applied to God, are used to express his endless existence, I beg leave to ask, why qualifying explanatory phrases are added by the sacred writers, as is so frequently done? I shall explain myself about this. For example, when *olim* is used to express time past, it is not only rendered of old, the days of old, ancient, ancient years, former years, but is explained to mean, many generations, the years of many generations, and from the beginning. Again, when it is used to express future time, we have also the following explanatory phrases given us concerning it: all thy days, throughout your generations, throughout all generations, to all generations, from generation to generation, many generations, every generation, the tenth generation, and a thousand generations. Besides, it is also limited or qualified by the duration of the sun, moon, host of heaven, and days of heaven. Had this word signified endless duration, all must have seen the propriety of adding such explanations when it was used to express a limited duration, for this was necessary to prevent misunderstanding. But what need was there to add the same or similar explanations when this term is applied to God? Why not let it have its full

unqualified meaning, if it really signified endless duration? But the sacred writers make no distinction, for they add the same restricting, qualifying expressions when it is applied to him, as when speaking of any thing else, as seen above from the passages where *olim* occurs. Indeed if this word signified endless duration, it was necessary to give such explanations when used to express a temporary duration, but surely altogether unnecessary when speaking of God. If persons will have it, that the subject to which *olim* is applied determines whether it is to be understood in a limited or endless sense, let them account for the fact, that such qualifying phrases are used when it is applied to God. What was their use or intention in such a connexion? Yea, I ask, ought we not rather to have had some phrases showing that *olim* when applied to God was to be understood in its most unlimited sense? This was necessary, seeing the word did not signify endless duration of itself, was applied so often to express limited duration, and was attended with such qualifying phraseology in so many instances. At any rate, when *olim* was applied to God, why were not such restricting phrases omitted? This would have been leaving the subject to which it is applied, to determine the extent of its meaning without any drawback from such limiting phrases. Were such phrases introduced for no purpose? But if introduced for the purpose of limiting or explaining *olim* in the one case, no candid man will question, but they were introduced for the same purpose in the other. For example, the priesthood of Aaron, is called an everlasting priesthood, but this is explained by the phrase "throughout your generations." So in other instances. Well, when it is said of God, "his mercy is from everlasting to everlasting," it is added by way of explanation, "his righteousness unto children's children." Psalm 103: 17. Again, when it is said

"thou art from everlasting," this is again explained by the words, "thy throne is established of old." Psalm 93 : 2. And is it said "thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom," we find it explained thus, "and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations." Psalm 145 : 13. And is it again said, "his mercy is everlasting," it is again added as an explanation "and his truth endureth to all generations."—Give me leave to ask, if everlasting meant endless duration, why are all these qualifying explanatory phrases added? Had the word *olim*, rendered everlasting, meant endless duration, and such qualifying phrases only been added when it was applied to things of a temporary nature, this would only be guarding the application of the term from abuse. But we see that such explanatory expressions are given when it is applied to God. Now if the term was intended to express his endless duration why was this the case? Why not omit them in all instances where he is spoken of, and only use them where this term is applied to things of limited duration? Had this been done, it would have shown, that the inspired writers did use a word which expressed endless duration, and judged it proper to guard its misapplication by such qualifying expressions. But if we consider the word *olim* as expressing limited and not endless duration, all the qualifying phrases used are proof that in this sense the sacred writers wished themselves to be understood by their readers. Is the question then asked, what is the limit of time expressed by this word. So far as I can see it is expressed by the qualifying expression "throughout all generations."

4th. The very repetition of *olim*, and rendered forever and ever, seems to show, that it was not designed to express God's endless duration. If forever, by itself, did express an endless duration of time, why add another forever to it. This was altogether su-

perfluous, for twenty forevers added, could not add to endless duration. How could adding another forever, make the first forever, or both taken together, an endless duration of time? Add as many forevers as you please to one another, if the first expresses a limited period, the number added must still fall infinitely short of eternity. They may make up a very long period of time, but still one which must come to an end. But I would leave it for candid men to consider, if the very adding one forever to another, does not fairly imply, that the sacred writers never intended to express endless duration by this mode of speaking. Many people seem to think, that "forever and ever," expresses endless duration, but if duly considered we think it leads to the reverse conclusion, for the very repetition of "forever" implies, that the first forever was of limited duration. This is confirmed, from considering that forever and ever, is indiscriminately applied to things which are to end, and to God himself. Besides, the sacred writers give us the same explanations, or qualifying phrases in both cases when they use this language. In short, whether forever and ever is applied to God, or to things of temporary duration, they guard us against understanding it as meaning a proper eternity. It is throughout all generations and as long as days shall be measured by the host of heaven.

5th. But if "forever," or, "forever and ever," is used to express endless duration, why speak of a period beyond this? Thus in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, other words are joined with it, which effectually restrict its meaning. Thus, Exod. 15 : 18. *The Lord shall reign forever and ever and further.* Dan. 12 : 3. *They shall shine as the stars forever and further.* Mic. 4 : 5. *We will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and beyond it.* See Unitarian Miscel. vol. ii. p. 33. The translators of this version

seem to have thought, that there was a period beyond forever, and forever and ever.

I am aware, that to all this it will be objected—“Does not David say, Psalm 90 : 2. ‘even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God,’ and does not this express the endless existence of God, both as to past and future? Is it not the same as if he had said, ‘thou art from infinite duration that is past to infinite duration to come?’” Plausible as this appears, when these words of David are attended to, they rather go to confirm the views which have been advanced. Hallet, in his Notes, vol. i. p. 75, 76. thus writes : “Psalm 41 : 13. ‘Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting, and to everlasting! amen, and amen.’ I am apt to think, that many English readers suppose, that the words *from everlasting*, signified a duration that was past in the days of the psalmist. But, on second thoughts, the English reader will perceive that this cannot possibly be. The psalmist here expresses his desire that God may be blessed. But it is impossible to desire, that God may be blessed heretofore. To say, *blessed be God in past ages*, would be as ridiculous as the advice a late divine has given Christians, to pray that the one catholic church may be built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. The text then must be rendered, *blessed be the Lord God of Israel from age to age! i.e. from this time forth, throughout all ages*. Every one will allow, that the Hebrew word *olam*, here rendered *everlasting*, does frequently signify *an age, or generation*. Nor will any one object to this interpretation of the word *and, from everlasting and to everlasting*; as if this would hinder us from rendering the expression, *from age to age*; when he shall consider that the word *and*, in such like expressions is redundant or superfluous in our language, whatever grace it adds to the Hebrew

phrase. Thus the Hebrew expression. 2 Chron. 9 : 26. is literally to be rendered, 'from the river *and* unto the land of the Philistines.' Our translators have rendered the Hebrew particle by *even*; 'from the river *even* unto the land of the Philistines.' It would have been as well if they had dropt it quite, and had said, 'from the river to the land of the Philistines.' See also 2 Chron. 30 : 5. So also the passage of the Psalm under consideration may be rendered, *blessed be God from age even to age*, or, more simply, *from age to age*. In the same sense the expression is to be understood, Psalm 103 : 17. 'The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting,' or rather from age to age, *i.e.* from this age to the next, and so on throughout all future ages. In the same manner, I conjecture, we must understand this same expression, Psalm 90 : 2. which I would render thus. 'Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth or the world, and from age to age thou art God.' "

But it is likely to be further objected, "That if 'forever and ever' is not admitted as expressing the endless existence of God, is not this attempting to do away his endless existence?" I would answer, by no means; for his endless existence is altogether independent of these terms being applied to him, and why give a wrong meaning to Scripture in support of this doctrine? Is there no other way of establishing the eternity of God's existence but by means of these words? If there had not, we should hardly think the inspired writers would have used such qualifying language in connexion with them, when they applied them to God. Instead of modifying, they would have added some additional phrase, to show that they wished to be so understood.

We think no considerate man will affirm, that *aion*, or *aionios*, of the New Testament can express endless

duration, unless *olim* of the Old, expresses such a duration. The New Testament writers in no case intimate that *olim* of the Old Testament signifies limited, but that *aion* and *aionios* of the New, mean eternal duration. On the contrary, they use these words in several instances as a correct expression of what is to be understood by *olim* in the Old Testament.

2d. But it is further supposed, that *olim*, *aion*, and *aionios*, rendered everlasting, must mean endless duration when applied to *life*; and “everlasting life,” is considered to be the never ending life, enjoyed beyond this mortal existence. If we have counted correctly the phrases *zoen aionion*, *zoe aionios*, *zoes aioniou*, and *aionios zoe*, occur just forty-three times in the New Testament. They are rendered everlasting life, eternal life, life everlasting, and life eternal; but all mean the same thing, as is evident from comparing in the Greek John 17: 2. with verse 3. and other passages. This phraseology is peculiar to the New Testament, as it occurs only Dan. 12: 2. and in reference to the age of the Messiah. Had it referred to a life common to believers under the Mosaic and Christian dispensations, why was this the case? If it means, as most Christians believe, the life or happiness of the heavenly state, Old Testament saints must have known it, for they looked for this. See Heb. chap. 11. But they are never said to have it, to have it abiding in them, or even to hope for it, which is often said of New Testament believers. Besides, though all the prophets bore witness to Christ, yet he is never called “eternal life” by any of them, as by the New Testament writers. The reason seems to be, that this title referred to his manifestation in the flesh; hence John calls him, “that eternal life which was with the father, and was manifested unto us.” This agrees to its being said, that “eternal life” was to be enjoyed in “the world to come,” or “the age of the

Messiah," which orthodox critics say above, "began at his first advent and shall be completed at his second coming." The word *everlasting* added to *life* proves nothing about its enjoyment in a future state or its endless duration, for the New Covenant is called everlasting. The kingdom, reign, and priesthood of Christ, are called everlasting. But does this mean endless duration? This kingdom Christ received, and he is again to deliver it up to God the father. Hence the Jews say, "that the kingdom of the Messiah shall return to its first author." And shall not his priesthood, called an everlasting priesthood, cease when he shall have none to intercede for, and his reign end, when all are subdued, and God be all in all? His priesthood shall not pass away like that of Aaron's, nor his kingdom like other kingdoms of this world, but shall continue while sun and moon endureth. The life enjoyed in this kingdom is called everlasting life, and the consolation in it everlasting consolation. In short, I conceive that all the everlastings of which the Scriptures speak, stand in some shape or other connected with God's dispensation of love and mercy to man through Jesus Christ. The ages or everlastings began with it, and shall terminate when Christ hath subdued all things, and the last enemy death is destroyed. Hence the state after this, does not appear to me to be described in Scripture by the expression "everlasting life," but by other words and phrases. For example—The dead are said to put on incorruption or immortality. Mortality is then to be swallowed up of life. They cannot die any more, but are equal unto the angels, being sons of the resurrection, their inheritance is *incorruptible* and *fadeth not away*, and they are to be (*pantote*) forever with the Lord.

The phrase "everlasting life," occurs only once in the Old Testament, but is of frequent occurrence in

the New. But why was this the case, and why is it spoken of as a thing enjoyed upon believing in Jesus, and as connected with his reign or kingdom which is to end, if it designated the life and enjoyment beyond the resurrection of the dead? Besides, it is set in contrast with the everlasting punishment, into which the Jews and others have gone for nearly eighteen hundred years, as shown above. It never can be proved, that it is ever contrasted with eternal death, or a punishment after the resurrection of all the dead. But this ought to have been its contrast, and contrasted as often as everlasting life is contrasted if the common doctrine be true. Were the inspired writers so perfectly indifferent about the eternal death of their fellow creatures, that they did not think it worth while once to mention it? They were surely not so much alarmed about this as many modern preachers are, for eternal life and eternal death are their constant themes, and they can not deny, that these expressions are used by them in contrast to describe the endless felicity and misery of men in a future state. But where did they learn this? Not from their Bibles, for it contains no such contrast. Such men must presume a great deal on the ignorance and credulity of their hearers, who think to make their sayings pass for the declarations of Jehovah.

3d. The term everlasting, is also applied to punishment; and it is confidently affirmed, that it expresses the endless duration of it. The places where it is so applied, are few in number, and can easily be counted by the reader, as they have all been laid before him. Such of them, on which dependence is placed in proof of the doctrine of endless punishment, have been fully and particularly considered. For example, Matth. 25: 46. and 2 Thess. 1: 9. the strong holds of this doctrine, have been razed to the

foundations. It has been proved, we think, that so far from those passages teaching the doctrine of *endless* punishment they do not even teach a punishment beyond this life. If these two texts fail in supporting it, it is useless to attempt its defence from any other part of Scripture.

To conclude. We have attempted to examine the common doctrines of the devil and eternal punishment with all the candor and fairness we could command. It has resulted in the fullest conviction, that these doctrines are not taught in Scripture, but are the production of the wisdom of this world, which is foolishness with God and which cometh to naught. Persuaded, the more the Scriptures are examined this will the more clearly appear, we have published our views on the subject; hoping it will be pursued by others who have more time, and better talents to throw additional light on it. We can sincerely say, that we have sought after the truth, and from the love of truth, for this only can stand, when all human devices in religion shall fall. If we have not found the truth, but have embraced error, we hold ourselves in readiness to attend to whatever can be said on the other side. Truth can never suffer by calm, candid discussion, but error shuns the light, deprecates investigation, and is ever ready to cry *heresy*, and that *the church is in danger*.

THE END.

INDEX

TO TEXTS PARTICULARLY ILLUSTRATED.

chap.	page.	chap.	page.
GEN. 3	19	ISAI. 13	117
4	331	31	276
26	35	33	239
32	331	34	117
LEVIT. 17	117	45	68
NUMB. 22	36	65	117
DEUT. 32	117	JER. 17	238
1 SAM. 29	37	20	ib.
2 SAM. 19	38	23	238, 334
24	41	EZEK. 8	84
1 KINGS 5	38	22	276
11	39	DAN. 7	303
2 KINGS 13	332	12	81, 239, 300
24	ib.	MICAH 5	204
1 CHRON. 21	40	ZEPH. 2	338
2 CHRON. 11	117	ZACH. 3	62
EZRA 4	43	MAL. 1	239
ESTHER 7	107	2 ESDRAS 2	88, 90
JOB 1	44, 331	4	88
2	ib.	6	90
PSALMS 9	239	7	89, 90
38	61	8	88
71	ib.	9	88, 89
91	117	12	90
96	ib.	14	90
106	ib.	TOBIT 3. 6. 8. 11	87
109	61, 62, 100	13	88
136	230	JUDITH 16	90, 92
139	330	ESTHER 1	90

chap.	page.	chap.	page.
WISDOM 2	86, 90	LUKE 8	162
ECCLES. 1	90	10	101
7	ib.	11	101, 170
18	89	12	291
19	86	13	102
21	86, 88	16	85, 267, 286
28	86	18	299
30	ib.	20	311
51	86, 88	22	100, 105
BARUCH 4	87	JOHN 4	260
SONG OF &C. V. 66	88	5	266
1 MAC. 1	86	6	119, 261
2 MAC. 7	90	8	126, 260, 261
14	86	9	85, 272, 261
MATTH. 4	151, 172	10	ib.
6	170, 263	11	ib.
12	101, 209	12	175, 261
18	140, 162, 171	13	105, 119, 261
	275, 281, 286	14	261, 175
16	99	16	175
18	337	17	273
19	299	ACTS 3	27, 273
21	261	5	107
24. 25	109, 141, 252	7	340
	256, 274, 309, 311	10	103, 142
28	262, 281	13	140
MARK 1	151, 162, 172	15	272
3	101, 291, 339	ROM. 1	263
4	286	3	340
7	342	9	263
8	99	11	ib.
10	299	12	286
11	261	16	109, 263, 264
LUKE 1	26, 263,		271, 258
	271, 273	1 COR. 1	286
4	100, 151, 172	2	272, 286

chap.	page.	chap.	page.
1 COR. 3	286	HEB. 2	236, 290
7	111	6	339
8	269	5	261, 267, 339
10	284	6	261, 290
15	265, 90	7	261
2 COR. 2	112, 116	9	266, 267, 283
4	179, 268, 285		331, 342
5	110, 268	11	269
11	73, 112, 173, 263	13	263, 266
12	103, 113	JAMES 1	108
GAL. 1	263, 285	4	147
4	340	5	55
EPH. 1	291	1 PETER 1	261, 266
2	179, 258, 260	4	263
3	264, 270	5	120, 263, 266
4	143	2 PETER 1	265
6	144, 285	2	337, 339
PHILIP. 4	263	3	267, 340
COL. 1	258, 265, 270	1 JOHN 2	261
2	340	3	133
1 THESS. 2	114	2 JOHN 2	262
3	174	JUDE 7	147, 337, 339
2 THESS. 1	326	REV. 1	263
2	114, 266	2	115
1 TIM. 1	111, 263	3	ib.
3	145, 118	4	263
5	114	5	ib.
6	263, 286	7	ib.
2 TIM. 1	272	10	ib.
2	146	11	ib.
3	119	12	163
4	123, 263, 286	14	263, 265, 344
TITUS 1	264, 265, 271	15	263
2	118, 273, 286	19	263, 344
PHILE. 15	260	20	163, 263, 344
HEB. 1	269	22	263









Acme

Bookbinding Co., Inc.

100 Cambridge St.

Charlestown, MA 02129



3 2044 054 757 075
